DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 415 HE 009 986

AUTHOR Hoffmann, Leonore, Ed.; DeSole, Gloria, Ed.
TITLE Careers and Couples: An Academic Question.
INSTITUTION Modern Language Association of America, New York, N. Y. Commission on the Status of Women.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 64p.; Small print of the document may prove marginally legible
AVAILABLE FROM Modern Language Association of America, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011, ISBN 0-87352-328-8, ($3.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *Career Opportunities; College Environment; *College Faculty; Females; Higher Education; Homosexuality; *Marriage; Partnership Teachers; *Part Time Teachers; Role Perception; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Stereotypes; *Teacher Employment; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS *Spouses

ABSTRACT

The 20 articles in this collection concern issues faced by couples in academe. One group of articles considers part-time careers, independent scholarly work, or intermittent employment, which may be viable alternatives for women with families or those who feel less need for a full-time job. The need for institutional policies to support part-time careers is discussed. Experiences with the dual career and difficulties of being an academic couple are discussed in several articles. A great role change, or the man following a woman to a new position, is described as are the antecedent conditions in a university which would not recognize the qualifications of the professional wife. In another article, a divorced professional woman and mother describes a career-couple conflict. In several articles, married academics describe the positive and negative aspects of sharing an appointment, a variation on part-time in which two people share one full-time appointment. Other articles describe responses to two different stereotypes: the faculty wife and the homosexual couple. Articles in the appendices address the problems of the professionally unemployed and provide information from the Modern Language Association Commission on the Status of Women: Affirmative Action for Women in 1971. Additional reading and resource persons are also listed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED157415

Careers and Couples:

an academic question

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

[illegible]

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

HE 009 986

Edited by Leonore Hoffmann and Gloria DeSole for the MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession

FIRST EDITION

1976

CN 990-297
3/23/78

Careers and Couples:

an academic question

Edited by Leonore Hoffmann and Gloria DeSole
for the
Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession

Modern Language Association of America
1976

Copyright © 1973 by the Modern Language Association of America

Cover design by Margaret Stone

Published by the Modern Language Association of America
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011

ISBN 0-87352-328-8

CONTENTS

Introduction Leonore Hoffmann and Gloria DeSole 1

THE PART-TIME CAREER

The View from Outside: Sustaining an Academic Commitment through Periods of Professional Unemployment Sylvia H. Myers 3

On Surviving the Part-Time System Nancy M. McCracken 5

The Fully Professional Part-Time Position Bernice W. Kliman 7

"The Problem That Won't Go Away in the English Department" Jane T. Flanders 11

Part-Timers Seek Collegial Support Elizabeth Segel 13

Yale Proposal to Regularize Part-Time Appointments 14

THE DUAL CAREER

The Great Role Change: Or, Trying to Remain an Academic Couple Suzanne and Joseph Juhasz 17

Can Two Enormous Ambitions Live Together? Dorin Schumacher 22

The Married Woman Scholar Marianne Shapiro 25

SHARED APPOINTMENTS

On Sharing an Academic Appointment Nancy G. Terrebonne and Robert A. Terrebonne 30

Good Work If You Can Get It: The Experiences of One Academic Couple David Schuman 32

Will the Real Professor Please Stand Up? Catherine Christie Nicholl 35

Some Thoughts on Job-Sharing Nancy and Peter Rabinowitz 37

Colleges Say They Get More for Their Money by Hiring a Couple to Share One Faculty Job Liz Roman Gallese 42

Sample Shared Appointment Contracts 44

SHARED LIVES

The Invisible Woman: Footnotes from a Faculty Wife Sandra Holstein 46

Two Non-Sexist Gay Grooms behind the Cotton Curtain Louie Crew 51

APPENDICES

The Professionally Unemployed Elaine Reuben 56

MLA Commission on the Status of Women: Affirmative Action for Women in 1971 57

ADDITIONAL READINGS AND RESOURCE PERSONS 59

Introduction

The familiar academic couple is, of course, the department chairman and his secretary. Breaking through familiar patterns in times of stress is difficult indeed, as women who demand and deserve equal access to employment and advancement have learned. Today, as an increasing number of teacher-scholars compete for a dwindling number of jobs, academics who are looking for employment in pairs face an even tougher struggle. If the question of careers and couples is not to remain purely academic, it is time for vigorous discussion.

The Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession of the Modern Language Association is sponsoring a series of pamphlets designed to describe the problems of women faculty and propose, when possible, solutions for those problems. The first pamphlet, Academic Women, Sex Discrimination and the Law, is an action handbook written, as the "Note to the Reader" says, "to provide a useful overview of the legal resources currently available to academic women, both for individuals who have experienced discrimination and for groups organizing to deal with patterns of discrimination in educational institutions."

"Unladylike and Unprofessional": Academic Women and Academic Unions, the Commission's second pamphlet, is a collection of essays aimed, as that preface observes, "to 'demystify' the nature of union activity for those who have not experienced it, and provide a useful sharing of information for women already involved."

Like the earlier volumes, Careers and Couples: An Academic Question came out of a panel at a Modern Language Association's Convention, in this case December 1974. At the same time the Commission was at work on a substantial overview of women in the profession now available as Study III: The Status of Women in Modern Languages, 1972-1973. The findings of that study once again illustrate serious discrepancies in the positive value of "personal items" in the careers of women and men. Men, for instance, will probably go farther if they are married and have dependent children. Academic women, on the other hand, are less likely to succeed if they have children or even if they are childless but married. Thus, it seems, women will be professionally more successful alone, and men will move ahead in rank much more quickly without strong ties to career-minded women. Clearly men and women are well advised to follow opposite courses in their personal lives if they want professional success. What, then, are the increasing numbers of academic couples to do?

The women and men who have contributed to this collection have made a variety of responses to this question, both personal and professional. The external organization of the pamphlet follows their professional responses—part-time careers, dual careers, shared careers, and shared lives—while the internal organization of the essays moves from self-confrontation to various types of interpersonal conflicts and resolutions, to professional encounters and sometimes resolutions.

In the first group, part-time careers, Sylvia Myers, Nancy McCracken, and Bernice Kliman all see independent scholarly work and part-time work as potentially creative, a viable alternative for women who feel that theirs is the major responsibility for the family as well as for those who feel less need for a full-time job. Without changes in institutional policies, however, independent and part-time workers remain on the fringes of the profession. Myers suggests "extending post-doctoral affiliation to individuals who wish to maintain an academic commitment even though they may be unemployed in the profession or employed part-time or intermittently." Bernice Kliman examines various proposals by Yale, Brown, and other schools to regularize part-time work for those who have the professional qualifications; i.e., to prorate salaries on the basis of full-time salaries and to provide the other guarantees, such as promotion and tenure, which full-time workers have.

Whereas academic institutions, through the low status of part-time work, have exploited the married academic woman because of her availability and immobility, they have often excluded her from full-time work through anti-nepotism policies. In the first essay of the dual career response, Suzanne Juhasz, before the Great Role Change, describes the pain of being a "faculty wife," of facing indifference and downright opposition from administrators when she attempted to find full-time work. Joseph Juhasz describes the pain of being a "faculty husband" after the Great Role Change. Neither is completely happy with this resolution, but the Great Role Change has not been all bad. For Suzanne, "a new sense of power has been added to my other competencies." For Joseph, "this capacity for feeling and fallibility (to be other than God the Father) is perhaps the most positive aspect of the Great Role Change for me personally." For Dorin Schumacher, the resolution was to drop the role of wife and become the unmarried professional, with all of its risks and uncertainties: "It is only through a process of risk-taking that true choices can be made, and that creative possibilities can emerge." The resolution that Marianne Shapiro has chosen is neither role reversal nor dropping the wife role but living apart

from her family, "a situation that encompasses built-in irregularities: job-changing, travel, a gulf between academic and domestic life." But on the positive side she notes: "If my daughter reads this paper ten years from now and finds nothing to respond to in it, I like to think my own statement may have in some measure served its purpose."

A third resolution to the conflict faced by married academics is the shared career or shared appointment, a variation on part-time in which two people—two men, two women, or one woman and one man—share one full-time appointment, thus avoiding the low status of part-time appointments. This resolution seems to combine the best of both worlds. As with part-time work, couples do not have to separate so that both can have jobs; and as with dual career solutions, both jobs are of equal importance. The minuses seem minimal. One is that these arrangements are rare: administrators need to be convinced of their workability, as the Terrebonnes report. Another problem is the financial, which the writers have minimized since they undoubtedly had dealt with it before taking the appointment; a third is the interpersonal conflicts which might not have been anticipated. Nancy and Peter Rabinowitz speak of the need to relieve the intensity of working together as well as living together. From a practical viewpoint, a problem which is to the institution's advantage but to the individual's disadvantage is that people who share appointments are inclined to work more than their contract requires, either from guilt—because they have more "free" time than others—or from their need to prove themselves professionally.

The pluses of the shared appointment outweigh the minuses. For students, there is a wider variety of insights and expertise available. Two people, although they work only part-time, offer different backgrounds and experience, not to speak of more energy, than does one full-time person. For students, as David Schuman notes, and for children in the family, as Catherine Nicholl observes, knowing that both people are working equally in the same situation helps to break down the sex-role stereotyping. The relationships gain because neither partner is an extension of the other and each cooperates with the other for their mutual benefit. The individual gains with more leisure to develop new interests and to define herself as somebody other than her professional work.

In the last group, shared lives, Sandra Holstein and Louie Crew describe their responses to two different stereotypes: the faculty wife and the homosexual couple. Some faculty wives, according to Holstein, go underground, become invisible. The problem with this resolution is "It is difficult for a person to think, feel, and define herself in a vacuum." The final essay by Louie Crew, describing a homosexual marriage in which there is no husband-wife relationship, serves to put the other essays in perspective. The dominant-male-submissive-female stereotypes are absent here because neither man has been conditioned to play these roles. This relationship suggests the freedom possible in a rolefree society.

Can academic couples have careers? The answers in these essays are not a resounding "yes"; the problems are not minimized. The discrimination against married academic women can hardly be questioned. The accounts in these essays are proof of it, if proof is needed. But if there is to be any change, we cannot dwell on the pain but must move beyond it. And there are affirmations: These women have protested against the stereotype and are stronger for it; some men are not only questioning their male roles but are rejecting them; and a few institutions have more flexible hiring policies. But more needs to be done, not only for the sake of the couples involved but for the students. The more varied the perspective of their instructors the richer their learning becomes. If married academic women are allowed to fulfill themselves professionally, everyone will benefit.

A majority of the writers in Careers and Couples learned of this project through the networks of the Modern Language Association's Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession and through the Women's Caucus for the Modern Languages. The range of response is extraordinary as women and men suggest a variety of alternatives from the personal through the legal. We thank all who have helped this discussion to begin.

Gloria DeSole
Albany, New York

Leonore Hoffmann
Youngstown, Ohio

7

The View from Outside: Sustaining an Academic Commitment through Periods of Professional Unemployment

Sylvia H. Myers

In November of 1973 Elaine Reuben wrote in the MLA Newsletter on the difficulties facing those who are or will be professionally unemployed. She wondered how and whether it would be possible for such people to continue to feel part of the profession through periods of unemployment. Reading her letter I realized that I had somehow managed to sustain an academic commitment for almost twenty years without continuous professional employment. My account of my experiences and suggestions for improving the situation of independent scholars may be of interest.

When I completed my doctorate in English in 1955, both jobs and women Ph.D.'s were relatively scarce. I was married to a scientist with a faculty appointment which it did not seem sensible to give up. Therefore I was limited to a popular geographical area in which institutions preferred to hire for regular appointments from a national pool of candidates. I considered the possibility of getting a job in another area, but that seemed too disruptive. So I gradually realized that I would have to give up the idea of a regular appointment, although I did not realize how decisive such a giving up would be.

At that time I felt in a unique situation, but in fact the women's movement has shown that women Ph.D.'s of my day who were married and therefore tended to be restricted to specific geographical areas because of their husbands' professional ties had difficulty establishing careers. In those days one could even be told, as I was by one faculty member, that a certain group of temporary teaching appointments were "reserved" for the men beginning their careers.

But there were other possibilities. I held a one-year teaching appointment, was able to spend some time in Europe, then undertook to raise a child. This task involved an interesting surprise. I discovered that the academic world, which I thought in dealing with literature was dealing with "life," had very little relevance to the "woman's world" in which I was now living. For a few years I immersed myself in this, to me, new world. I tried other supplementary activities. Then I found that my old interests were reasserting themselves. Was it possible to combine these worlds?

I had some hints that I chose to follow. In a little book, The Art of Teaching (New York: Vintage, 1956), Gilbert Highet had suggested that a new college teacher should plan "his" career by deliberately choosing three or four related interests which he would then pursue. By following this method over a period of years the scholar would find that he was developing mastery of several subjects in his field, and because of this growing expertise he would have more things to work on than he could probably cover. I wondered if, working independently, I might be able to do something like that. I could continue to study certain aspects of eighteenth-century literature, the novel as a form, and develop my growing interest in the work and problems of women writers. Virginia Woolf, whose feminist views had probably encouraged me originally, was also helpful, with her practical advice in A Room of One's Own about the value of having a study and some money. In fact, I had taken care to move into a house that did have that key feature, an extra room suitable for a study of my own. We found money in the family budget for part-time child care so that I could go out to the university library; I already held a library card as a faculty wife. Later I found reinforcement for my idea, especially that of working on women writers, in an article by Lotte Bailyn, "Notes on the Role of Choice in the Psychology of Professional Women," which appeared in the Daedalus issue on The Woman in America (Spring, 1964). Bailyn suggested that one way for women to bridge the gap between the domestic and the intellectual life was to work on the problems of women.

At some point I started to read on a regular basis, not entirely sure what I could or wanted to do. But I found that my graduate education had at least had the value of teaching me how to work on my own. Over the years I have managed to combine raising two children with study and research, some writing and publication, and what has added up to a surprising amount of part-time teaching, some of it involving courses whose subjects have been of particular interest to me or have required innovative approaches. Along the way I added some interests, in autobiographical and biographical writing, and in literary and textual bibliography which I worked on in a formal program of study.

In addition to having the benefit of the use of the university library and some study space there from time to time, I have been able to make use of opportunities to study and do research

at other American and British libraries, either as a visiting faculty wife or with letters of introduction. My interests have given me personal incentives and entertainment when I traveled. I've hunted for Smollett's tomb in the English cemetery at Leghorn, sat in on courses at the University of Zurich, traveled to Wales to visit the area where Mrs. Piozzi lived. In retrospect I see that by subscribing to journals, building up a personal library, belonging to professional organizations, and by attendance at some meetings, I have been able to develop a feeling that my scholarly efforts are, though largely unpaid, real and ongoing. A sense of isolation has been a major difficulty. But this has been counteracted from time to time by encouragement from some professors, by the lift that publication brings, and by the challenges presented by the teaching opportunities that have come up.

Could my situation have been helped by more institutional support? I think so, especially at the beginning. Learned societies, foundations, and universities might consider ways of extending postdoctoral affiliation to individuals who wish to maintain an academic commitment even though they may be unemployed in the profession or employed part-time or intermittently. Departments could sponsor postdoctoral affiliates, who would gain status and morale from such "credentialing." Learned societies could try to acknowledge the status of the independent scholar as a respectable one, in terms of dues and membership schedules, submission of manuscripts, and access to editorial or other related academic work. I have sometimes thought that the creation of "institutes," either sponsored by a university with a research library or developed by learned societies as a regional network, would be productive in providing a focus for postdoctoral affiliates to exchange research interests and ideas. Such institutes need not be limited to any particular discipline. They might be supported by foundation funds, if possible, and sponsor seminars and publications. These institutes would be a useful way of developing a communal intellectual life for the independent researchers and visitors in a particular area. The independent scholars of such an institute would be a recognizable group of people who could be called on for part-time or temporary teaching assignments. They would have an address on an institutional letterhead and some visibility in the academic world.

Even without such supports it is obviously possible to sustain an academic commitment over a period of years without continuous professional employment, but only if an individual is willing and able for particular reasons to pursue a course of action that does not carry the usual benefits of a regular full-time paid position. If such needs are pressing, then I think it would be better to give up and go on to some other activity. For the academic commitment, while personally satisfying, does not seem to lead back into the profession.

Over the years I had hoped to develop a part-time connection that was continuous and reasonable in terms of conditions of employment; such a situation never seemed to develop. Part-time employment by its nature seems to be intermittent, insecure, lacking in fringe benefits. At one time I thought that affirmative action programs might make it possible for someone who had not been continuously employed to return to regular employment. In the final analysis academic institutions are structured in such a way that reentry to regular "ladder-type" appointments is very difficult.

But why shouldn't qualified people who have maintained academic commitments have the opportunity to return to work? My final suggestions are therefore in the nature of a program of "affirmative action" for reentry academics:

(1) Foundations should eliminate from their fellowship applications those restrictions of age and status that presuppose a traditional career pattern.

(2) Departments and institutions should attempt to develop postdoctoral fellowship programs to assist persons to return for added study, research, and writing.

(3) Departments should allocate a number of temporary teaching appointments for postdoctoral affiliates, to permit reentry persons to develop further continuity of experience.

(4) Colleges and universities should broaden criteria for hiring at all levels so that reentry individuals are not automatically excluded from consideration because of age or the nontraditional pattern of their professional experience.

I have known other women who have managed to maintain some kind of academic commitment by flexibility and persistence, in spite of geographical limitations and family responsibilities. Men and women beginning their work now will need both flexibility and persistence to sustain their academic commitments through periods of unemployment. The academic profession could reflect a sense of responsibility toward the students it has educated by trying to create more flexible career patterns, thus offering greater access to academic work to those who find themselves for some period of time outside the profession.

On Surviving the Part-Time System

Nancy M. McCracken

I have been a part-time person most of my adult life. This has been by choice. As the wife of a college English professor and mother of two small children, I have had to choose between surviving full-time on homemaking (i.e., poverty and madness) and part-time teaching (i.e., poverty and madness). Being utterly unsuited to the art of homemaking, and only slightly so to teaching, the choice has, so far, been easy. I have filled all my spare time since marriage attempting to fatten a very slim dossier toward the day when I can hit the "teaching market" full steam. By recounting some of my experiences, I hope to make the point that part-time teaching, if viewed as a temporary role (perhaps the ultimate in cockeyed optimism), offers some surprising benefits to the part-timer who learns to exploit the system.

The first year of my career, I taught "socially maladjusted" students in Illinois while my husband took his Ph.D. Although that was technically a full-time position, it carried the social and professional stigma of part-time work. As everyone knows, teachers of honors sections are very bright, drama teachers are dramatic, humanities teachers are humane, and, of course, teachers of the socially maladjusted must be . . . . As in part-time teaching, pay was minimal, prestige was nil, and when colleagues looked at all, they looked down.

My husband finished his degree and we moved to Youngstown, Ohio, where I immediately began work on an M.A. in English, determined to somehow get the credentials of a full-time person. Although I had tuition waived as a dependent of a faculty member, I took an assistantship—both to soothe my female ego and for a chance to teach college English. I was saddened to learn that teaching Freshman Composition carries roughly the same professional status as teaching the socially maladjusted in high school. I also learned that teaching Freshman Composition at an open admissions university within the traditional structure we offered was not only a wasteful activity, but a pernicious one. I finished the degree, determined to explore better means of teaching writing.

For my next position, I spent the summer in the basement of Sam's beauty salon coaching female employees of the county welfare department to pass the high school equivalency exam. The welfare department pays part-time teachers and rents Sam's basement for a program ironically called "Staff Upgrade." Inhaling permanent wave lotion while stepping on cockroaches and conjugating irregular verbs from the 1952 grammar book had an unsettling effect. I turned elitist and took a job teaching Advanced Placement English at a private girls' high school. The salary was so poor that I probably could have claimed several thousand dollars on my tax forms for de facto contributions to the Catholic Church, but it was a good year, and the one when I learned most about surviving the part-time system. I encountered severe problems with faculty relationships--I was teaching only one class; I was a lay person among nuns; I taught a college level course for seniors, the brightest students in the school. There was virtually no communication with other faculty there, no way to share ideas with others in the English department or to do joint teaching projects. I was simply not recognized as a faculty member. Basically, I felt I had no colleagues there—a problem with part-time teaching I have come to feel more and more deeply. But that experience also taught me the most valuable thing I know about part-time teaching: I was able to teach one of the best classes ever taught—by virtue of being part-time. Since nobody took the least interest in what I was doing, I had total freedom. We read books that a full-time teacher (under full-time supervision and censorship) would not have dared to suggest in that school. I didn't go back to my private girls' school the following year both because the salary offered was insufficient even to take care of babysitting for my two preschoolers and because, even though my students and the class were tremendously stimulating, I simply missed having professional colleagues.

I began work as a part-time instructor at the university where my husband teaches. I had a good relationship with the faculty, having just completed my masters degree here, which enabled me to function in a role other than mere faculty wife. I began putting to use the subversive secret I'd learned about part-time. Sure enough, it worked on the university level as well. In fact, there is even more freedom at the university, because in addition to no one caring what part-time people do, there is practically no interest whatever in Freshman Composition. The possibilities for experiment were limitless. I settled for administering a short-form reading test to several classes of freshmen with a predictable result that one third to one quarter of our freshmen were reading at a level below tenth grade. I did some formal and informal readability studies of our freshman composition texts and dug out grade reports for the past few years. I began working with our chairman and proposed a tracking system with wide-ranging effects. Aware of my precarious freedom, I reluctantly sent a report to all members of the department on the new proposal for Freshman Composition. My reluctance was uncalled for, because, as usual, nobody noticed.

The experiment turned out to be a good one. We set up a fine writing lab, altered the syllabus for certain tracked sections of Freshman Composition, enjoyed the full support of the director of Freshman Composition and several very enthusiastic full-time and part-time faculty. Once again, I had total freedom in materials and class procedures and in setting up the lab. I was doing the work that my past experience had uniquely qualified me to do; it was significant work, and I felt I had at last found a way to make a useful contribution working within the part-time system. Alas, for me, the experiment was too good. It's embarrassing to have a successful department project going on that is being directed by a part-time person. For us part-timers, the Peter Principle works in reverse. I have been relieved of my duties, told to be grateful for having had the opportunity to try out my ideas, and the experiment I began is now in official full-time hands. I will be back in the fall perhaps, if my contract is renewed, scheming up some new project which this time I will certainly keep under my hat.

I do have a few options during the next few years. The obvious one is to begin work quickly on the Ph.D., but that seems a long way around to be able to teach Freshman Composition full-time, and, given the glut of Ph.D.'s in English, I'm sure that's what would happen. I could go to the union here and request that they include part-time people in the bargaining unit. But they won't; the union position as stated by two officers is that part-time instructors are "scabs," and will remain so until they start demanding pay on the same scale as full-time. They, of course, fail to see that without their support this is impossible.

There is no one to represent us, and no way to reconcile a grievance. We are sinners in the hands of any student, administrator, or colleague who wishes to make a complaint. Although we teach a large percentage of the Freshman Composition courses, we are not included in departmental policy decisions for these courses. As an elected representative of part-time English faculty, I have a smaller voice in departmental decisions than undergraduate English majors (part-time people aren't even notified when meetings are to occur). Within the university community at large, there is no recognition of our work. Our students never read about our scholarly achievements in the campus newspaper, although even attending a local workshop is cause for a full-time instructor to receive publicity. We aren't even listed in the college catalog. There are more serious difficulties than these in teaching. Part-time people here don't get notified which courses, if any, they are going to teach until a day or so before the beginning of classes. This makes it difficult to prepare syllabi, arrange office hours, and choose texts. Funds are not available for part-time instructors to attend conferences and thus keep abreast of innovations in their fields. The fact that part-time people are given no responsibilities beyond meeting their classes doesn't exactly foster innovation, excellence, and cooperation between part-time and full-time members of the department. Finally, all of the part-time instructors here are afraid of losing their jobs, as well they should be. Contracts are issued quarterly, and there are plenty of local people ready to fill vacancies.

A last option I have is to stay at it and hope for the ideal. In my utopia, universities like mine will heed Michael Shugrue's warning "that the role of college English teachers has shifted from introducing students to 'great literature' to introducing 'growing numbers of young adults to literacy—to reading, writing, and even to speaking.' " Except for the most prestigious departments, those that continue to "treat their major primary function as literature departments are going to face further retrenchment" (in Malcolm G. Scully, "Crisis in English Writing," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 1974). There will always be the need for the medievalist and the Shakespearean scholar, but there is also currently the need for the specialist in teaching Freshman Composition. Where will the departments find those specialists? The current Ph.D.'s won't do; they resent each Composition class they have to teach. But there is a cadre of highly skilled and devoted specialists available in the pool of part-time instructors. Perhaps departments will begin to recognize them; perhaps unions will begin to apply some of their egalitarian ideals to them.

Meanwhile, I am not optimistic. I have two more years of (child) restricted employment. If I am able to fight off total cynicism during that time, I will pursue whatever is necessary to be a full-time instructor. If it is necessary to write a dissertation on John Webster's heroines in order to receive a fair salary for teaching Freshman Composition, then that's what I will do. For now, I am simply making the best of an unworkable position, and I am gaining—not financially, but professionally. I have had experiences during my part-time stint that have been the sources of several articles. The fact remains that I have taught Freshman Composition for five years and have spent at least one year researching and coordinating experimental classes. I've had experience working with the socially maladjusted (both students and administrators) as well as with the very brightest students. Even the basement of Sam's beauty salon hasn't gone to waste. On my placement file it reads: Educational Consultant, Mahoning County Welfare Department. These are things I have stolen from my various part-time employers. And this is the message I would convey to women in my position. With small children, you can't (unless you

are very lucky or not especially fond of small children) make a great deal of money teaching. As a part-time person at a university, you won't have much prestige, and few people in your department will take an interest in what you are doing. What you will have is an enormous amount of freedom—freedom from departmental syllabi, from committees, from department politics, and freedom to experiment (provided you keep it a secret). You don't have to be a full-time instructor to develop new concepts, to read, do practical research, and publish.

I view this time in my life as an opportunity for enforced professional growth, a sabbatical before the fact. I have worked in some way with the profession for the seven years I have been married. I haven't yet made a salary commensurate with the work because it has all been part-time, but my dossier is getting fat and I'm staying lean, and that can't be all bad. One of these days I might even have a crack at being a full-time person, and, if not, I have learned to survive the part-time system.

The Fully Professional Part-Time Position

Bernice W. Kliman

When couples have careers they may find that part-time work for one or both is not only feasible but also desirable. Although a shared position is one possibility, it is one that is fraught with problems. A separate part-time position, preferable for either or both husband and wife, may also interest single people at some time in their careers. A part-time position that is not demeaning is one with less than full-time teaching responsibilities, usually half-time, compensated proportionately, with commensurate responsibilities and benefits, including: committee assignments, a vote in the department and on the faculty, fringe benefits, opportunities for tenure and promotion, a chance to teach electives and to apply for grants, travel reimbursement and all other aids to scholarship, and the privilege of having extended contact with students as adviser and tutor. I call this the fully professional part-time position.

It is designed for fully trained individuals who are either now part-time faculty members with less than desirable status or who are not working in a college at all because a full-time schedule is impossible and the available part-time positions lack status and adequate compensation. The supposition is that these people would prefer to work part-time. There are also others who would be willing to work full-time but who are forced to work part-time. At least the grossest forms of exploitation should be eliminated so that all these individuals can work part-time in dignity. Moreover, in these times that are so bad for the job seeker, it is imperative that we attempt to upgrade the part-time job so that it will become attractive to all those now working full-time who can afford to reduce their income; many would welcome a chance to work part-time at least temporarily. It is unconscionable that there are some who are feasting when others are suffering famine. I for one would be happy to reduce my teaching load and my income by half if I could be assured of something better than second-class status.

I have not always been interested in this kind of position for myself. While I was getting my training in graduate school, I thought I would be able to be everything—the perfect wife, mother, teacher, scholar, friend—all full-time for each. In fact, perfection at all these jobs is what I asked of myself. Only then could I be justified in going outside the usual woman's roles. But after earning my Ph.D. in June 1969 from the City University of New York, with four children at home, I faced my own reality and decided to work part-time—for a while. I felt I could not cope with full-time teaching, scholarship, and family responsibilities. Any two, yes; but not all three.

I took a part-time job at Queens College in fall 1969. Now I have worked one year full-time at Baruch, so I think I can speak about the differences. Although I began by thinking that part-time work would be temporary, I ended by believing, fervently, that it enabled me to release all my creative energy in the directions that were important to me. There are, however, serious disadvantages in part-time work as it is now structured in many colleges.

In 1969 at Queens College, I thought I would be considered a professional, but gradually I found there were distinct differences between me and my full-time colleagues. For one thing, I was treated as if I were a graduate student, although I had a Ph.D. and several years of experience. This meant that I was to teach only composition; more important—something that was not made clear until my third year—there was to be a three-year limit on my employment. Second, I had no vote in the department, even though composition was an important concern of the department. Nor was I asked to serve on any committee. Third, my pay was less than half, about one third, for a more than two-thirds load. And Queens College pay is much higher than that of most places. Also, there were no fringe benefits, including no right to apply for grants within the university and to use the grants office to apply for outside grants. So this important

means of promoting my scholarship was denied to me. Fourth, I was not permitted (officially) to advise students or to give tutorials. And, finally, I had no opportunity to work for tenure or promotion.

But at the beginning I did not know I was a second-class citizen. So with the confidence inspired by my new Ph.D., in the years I was at Queens I once taught medieval literature at night, just by asking for it and not realizing that I should not have even asked; helped found a medieval club that met twice monthly for three years; established and ran a poetry reading series, with faculty and student participation; edited a journal of freshman compositions, used as an adjunct text, and persuaded the college to publish it (three editions to date); organized and ran film series; prepared and taught new film courses for the Honors Department; taught tutorials on the novel and on film. Obviously, the college received much of my energy and devotion. Why then did I not want to work full-time? The difference was simply the amount of time I had at home. I went to Queens twice a week as a part-timer. Many of the extra activities I could manage on the other days while I was with my family. I was also able to pursue scholarly activities, producing six articles in those three years. I came to realize that my part-time job was better for everyone concerned than a full-time job would be. But when my position at Queens ended, I could find only the kind of part-time position that would be at least as limiting as the Queens position. So I reluctantly sought full-time work. Unsuccessful, I became a free lance (a euphemism for migrant worker). Although I found interesting teaching assignments, without a stable academic address I felt like a nonperson. So when the offer of a full-time position came from Baruch College, I accepted it gladly.

Although I believe I have maintained a balance among teaching, scholarship, and family, I know that this year I spent proportionately less time on each of these. Also, I have not been as active in the college as I would like. Of course not every part-time faculty member will want to be so involved in collegiate activities—any more than will every full-time member. But it seems clear that fully professional part-time positions can be beneficial both to colleges and to faculty members.

There are, however, questions of implementation. I would like to suggest some of them and possible answers for each of the three interested categories of academics: the faculty member, the department, and the administration. Finally, I shall describe the plans for fully professional part-time positions at several universities.

First the questions. For the faculty member: Will he or she be exploitable through tutorials, theses supervision, committee assignments, and even courses? Answer: The course proportion for part-timers must be figured on the basis of contact hours, and the full-time load for other duties must be defined. For example, if at a four-year college a full-time professor has a classroom load of nine hours with six conference hours and is expected to spend an average of two additional hours on student-related and departmental tasks, then the half-time load would be 8½ hours. This could be organized with two three-credit courses, four hours of conferences, and no departmental duties one semester and one three-credit course, two hours of conferences, and two hours of departmental duties the second semester. The full-time professor would then spend an additional 20–30 hours per week on preparation, scholarship, professional activities, and expansion of knowledge. The part-time professor could spend proportionately less time on these activities, according to his or her own schedule. On the other hand, at community colleges, where the teaching load may be twelve hours each semester, the half-time schedule would be two three-credit hours each semester, with all the other responsibilities halved. Each department will have to determine its full-time load and obviously there will be discrepancies. Although the average at a four-year college may be 17 hours, some professors spend as many as 20 hours or more or as few as 9 or even less. Obviously, then, the half-time professor working 8½ hours is approaching the work level of some full-time professors. Nevertheless, by computing averages, equity is possible.

For the department: Will the part-time faculty member be as committed to the department as the full-time member? This is possibly the easiest question to answer. The same tests that are applied to any full-time member should be applied, proportionately, to the part-time member. If he or she is not satisfactory for any reason, tenure need not be conferred.

For the administration: Clearly there are some bureaucratic questions associated with having academics teach part-time. These must be answered satisfactorily, for if the administrators can be convinced that colleges will benefit by this proposal for fully professional part-time positions, they will support it and help persuade department chairmen to implement it actively. Some of the questions administrators I interviewed asked are: One: What is going to happen to the money-saving adjunct position? For example, at City University of New York, adjunct faculty make up one third of the total staff. Paid hourly, they obviously provide an inexpensive source of labor. Answer: The adjunct position will be retained (as it is at both Yale and Brown). It is for people who have not yet finished professional training or for nonacademic

professionals, doctors, lawyers, engineers, businessmen, high school teachers, and administrators, who want to teach one or two courses with no further commitment to students, the department, or scholarship. These are called "moonlighters" at Wesleyan, as opposed to "sunlighters"--part-time faculty whose primary professional commitment is to the college. The adjunct position is extremely important to colleges whose enrollments are unpredictable and there is no reason for eliminating it. But a clear distinction must be made, as Wesleyan has, between two types of part-time faculty. "Moonlighters" and graduate students should become the adjunct faculty and "sunlighters" the regular part-time faculty. By no means should the adjunct position become a means of exploitation of people--faculty wives, for example--who are fully trained and whose professional center is the college.

Two: Won't more people mean more desks, greater space needs, more paper work? Answer: There should not be very many more people at any given time because only a small proportion, possibly no more than 10% per department, will be regular part-time faculty. These should not pose so great a burden that the many benefits do not compensate. In any case, part-time faculty, not being present every day, should be willing to share offices if necessary. Many full-time faculty are doing this already.

Three: How can fringe benefits be prorated when full-time employees get fully paid benefits; there is no half benefit? Answer: At first glance this may seem one of the more complicated problems, but I believe it is not so difficult to solve. Pension contributions are now figured as a percentage of salary; this percentage would remain the same for part-time and full-time faculty. That is, the pension benefit may be 80% of the average salary for the last five years before retirement. This would be the same percentage whether one earned $20,000 as a full-time professor or $10,000 as a part-time professor. Also, a year's work should be computed by time, not by number of hours. That is, 8½ hours work per semester, if that is the half-time rate, should be considered the basis of a full year's work. Blue Cross and other such benefits are frequently paid for people at every salary level--from secretaries to presidents. The part-time academic would, I believe, earn as much as many on the staff with fully paid health benefits. And if benefits are only partially paid by the college, the part-time academic can pay the same percentage as the full-time faculty member. With good will all around and a good accountant, I think this problem can be resolved.

Four: Will accreditation be jeopardized? The answer is "no." Since, presumably, people who now have second-class status will be treated like the professionals they are, the reputation of the college should be enhanced. Even if a college does not now have adjunct staff, a small number of committed professionals who are working part-time and sharing their creative energy with their colleagues should improve the college's standing.

Five: Perhaps the most irritating question is, "Will the person who wants to work part-time--perhaps not working at all at the moment--become another competitor for the few jobs available to people who want and need full-time jobs?" Answer: This question in effect is the same so often asked by people who say, "But if we give women whose husbands are already working these jobs, won't we be forced to exclude men who need jobs?" The point is that many of us, men and women both, need to work in order to feel that we are somebody. We create ourselves by the work we do. And in any well-ordered society there should be work enough for everybody, whether they want to work full- or part-time. There is no satisfactory answer because it is not a satisfactory question. But part-time positions will create more not fewer positions overall.

Six: More important, how can flexibility be managed--between part- and full-time--for easy movement between the two? This is a very serious issue, because, it seems to me, without flexibility, the part-time position is truly inferior to the full-time position. Answer: Each person, whether part- or full-time, should occupy a full-time slot or line. If only part of that slot is occupied at a given time because the person, with the agreement of his or her department, decides to work part-time for a given period, the remainder of the salary for that slot should be used for temporary faculty, such as Visiting Professors (like Yale's Visiting Fellows--artists and professionals, academics and nonacademics, eager to teach temporarily) or to support graduate students with temporary teaching fellowships. With six months advance notice, and agreement on all sides, a faculty member should be able to change from part- to full-time or vice versa.

With all these questions and more, is it worthwhile to agitate for the fully professional part-time position? I believe it is. For the individual it would mean time to devote to creative arts, politics, family--even to scholarship, student conferences, and college activities beyond the amount of time usually allotted to these activities--or any other interests and yet be a fully recognized member of the academic community. For the department it would mean a chance to hire a Milton expert to teach one or two courses without having to worry about finding two more courses for him or her to teach. Departments should certainly be pleased at the opportunity to

save money without exploiting anyone. A greater number of faculty members, some teaching a fractional load, can be beneficial to the profession as a whole and to students, who will have more minds to relate to. For the administration it can mean a chance to make affirmative action a reality by creating more positions that are attractive to women—but not, of course, only to women. It is no accident that the push for fully professional part-time positions has come from women's groups. But we must not lose sight of the fact that unless we can show that these positions are attractive to men too, the positions will become another means to confer second-class status on women. For the administration, also, it can mean a chance to attract people who work in many diverse fields who will enrich everyone's academic experience with their special knowledge and skills. I am referring here not only to people who will be drawn to a nonexploitive part-time position, but also to the temporary faculty that can be engaged using the unoccupied portion of lines belonging to part-time faculty (as discussed previously under flexibility).

For example, the Brown University faculty voted on a proposal to create a fully professional part-time position (actually there have been men in such positions, but unofficially), but the Corporation has not yet acted on the resolution. According to the resolution, there are to be three categories of part-time faculty: Adjunct or Special Part-Time faculty, not eligible for tenure; Clinical Part-Time faculty, not eligible for tenure; Regular Part-Time faculty, eligible for tenure. The Research lines remain unaffected by the resolution; they are still nontenured lines, both full- and part-time. Both Clinical and Research lines are used in science departments.

The intention is that the Regular Part-Time staff should comprise a small (unspecified) percentage of the whole faculty. No restrictions are placed on outside employment, except with respect to conflict of interest. What this means is that the same restrictions on outside academic employment apply to both full-time faculty and part-time faculty. There are also to be the same standards for hiring, promotion, conferral of tenure, and so on. Change in status, from part- to full-time or vice versa, may be made by joint agreement between the university and the individual, with review every three years. Tenure decisions can be made at a proportionate date, but need not be. This feature is meant to safeguard the part-time employee. That is, he or she will not be expected to produce in seven half years what a full-time academic produces in seven full years. Therefore, the part-time faculty member may but need not take up to fourteen half years to earn tenure. The Brown resolution is excellent.

Yale's resolution is already in effect, but only four part-time appointments have been made, two in the Medical School. However, concurrent developments have bettered the lot of many who were already working part-time in research positions. The Yale resolution provides full professional status to anyone working part-time (at least half-time) in any rank from instructor to full professor. Existing faculty members may request a part-time position for reasons of family or health. The position is considered part-time not only with respect to teaching, but also research and departmental obligations. That is, a full-time faculty member is expected to spend about half his or her time on research. A part-time faculty member would spend proportionately less time on research. With some exceptions, the part-time faculty member is to have no outside employment. Only a small percentage of the staff is to be part-time, and a change in status to part-time must be equally advantageous to both the department and the faculty member. It is considered, normally, to be a temporary position, with the date for return to be decided in advance. Money released by this temporary part-time status should be used for temporary appointments. Benefits: leaves of absence, fellowships, and summer stipends, proportionate to full-time, that is, a percentage of yearly salary; travel funds up to $300, equal to full-time; retirement, equal to full-time; health plan, equal to full-time; disability benefit, not available for part-time because of stipulation (at present) in the insurance contract; mortgage loan, equal to full-time; group life insurance, equal to full-time. The only flaw in this otherwise superior resolution is the limitation on the reasons for seeking part-time employment.

The Faculty Senate of the University of Pittsburgh will be voting this fall on a proposal that would make possible half-time appointments in the tenure stream for fully qualified people. The provisions of the proposed change are similar to the Brown University resolution. It seems likely that the proposal will be approved. Another, more controversial, proposal would require that after a year of employment a part-time faculty member, upon reappointment, could no longer be viewed as a "temporary," or "emergency," employee. He or she must be paid a salary proportionate to that of a full-time faculty member with comparable duties, must receive fringe benefits, participate in across-the-board salary increments, etc. Ideally, this would reduce the exploitation of large numbers of part-time faculty who will in all probability not receive tenure-stream appointments.

This class of employees, known as "twilighters" at Wesleyan, is not otherwise employed but usually does not have full professional qualifications. (On yearly contracts, they receive prorated salaries and fringe benefits but do not vote in the department.) At Wesleyan at present there are four or five moonlighters, ten to twelve twilighters, and two or three sunlighters. At the larger, public institutions the numbers in each category are likely to be much bigger but the proportions will probably be similar.

Finally, City University of New York (CUNY): according to an administration survey very few adjuncts want to work full-time but many do merit full professional status. Although the administration's Affirmative Action Committee had recommended in 1973 the creation of fully professional part-time positions for adjuncts, a spokesman of the Affirmative Action Office now says that "because of severe budget cutbacks, the administration has postponed consideration of policies and practices with regard to part-time personnel." The issue of the part-time faculty has, however, come up at the current contract negotiations, the union asking for full professional status for all the adjunct staff, with prorated salary and fringe benefits and promotion possibilities. Tenure is not being asked, but only two evaluations of "unsatisfactory" by faculty observers over a period of three semesters can be used as a reason for firing an adjunct, and then only if he or she has been employed less than ten semesters. The union's overriding concern, one official told me, is to end exploitation of the adjunct faculty.

Many other colleges and universities either have resolutions pending or have already implemented plans for creating fully professional part-time positions: for example, Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, Colgate, Columbia, Pennsylvania State University, University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin. All over the country, interest is growing in part-time positions. It is an idea whose time has come. With many couples working, it makes sense for one or both to work part-time. When even a small percentage work part-time because they want to, there will be more positions for others who have no jobs. A glance at the Report of MLA's Commission on the Status of Women shows that by 1971, one third of the departments surveyed had flexible hiring practices. The question is, what can we do to strengthen this trend?

"The Problem That Won't Go Away in the English Department"*

Jane T. Flanders
Part-Time Lecturer in English

The Department of English carries out a mammoth task in offering almost 300 sections of undergraduate literature and writing courses. (This number covers all courses offered by CAS and SGS at Oakland and extension campuses, fall 1974.) Yet it is drastically understaffed by regular faculty. Currently the department employs 59 graduate students as teachers, chiefly in beginning literature courses, but also relies on 82 part-time instructors to teach composition and literature. The "part-time problem" in the English department has now reached crisis proportions.

Here are the figures: in fall term 1974, of all undergraduate English courses in literature and writing (or sections of courses) a total of 71% are being taught by nonregular faculty (45% by part-timers and 26% by graduate teaching assistants and fellows). This leaves only 29% taught by fulltime faculty. Of the undergraduate literature sections, only 51% are taught by fulltime faculty, while the remaining 49% are taught by nonregular faculty. Of all writing courses, only 12% are taught by full-time faculty, while a staggering total of 88% of writing courses are taught by part-time faculty (74%) and by T.A.'s and T.F.'s (14%). Discounting advanced writing, the figure soars to 98% of composition courses taught by nonregular faculty. Only in upper-level literature courses are these statistics reversed, 92% taught by full-time faculty, for because of the pressure toward specialization and the requirements for tenure, it is in this "traditional" area that their professional interest lies.

It is indefensible for an English department of a reputable university to staff such a large percentage of its classes with part-time faculty, especially when part-time status entails exploitation. There are excellent reasons for using part-time teachers—to demonstrate "affirmative action," for instance, or to make use of experience which a part-timer can bring into the classroom from another kind of work—but there can be no academic justification for the current misuse of part-time instructors by the Pitt English department.

* From University Times (University of Pittsburgh), 14 November 1974.

It is not surprising that 60% of part-timers are female, most of them married. It is evident that the part-time labor pool is made up largely of those unable to leave the vicinity or to find more satisfactory work here, and that most part-timers teach because they badly need the money. A large group—among them many Pitt graduates—are teaching part-time only because they cannot find full-time jobs. Of those who prefer to teach part-time, only a few cite "family considerations" for this choice; most claim "professional reasons." A good number hold other jobs, mostly teaching jobs. In fact, there is some concern over the "moonlighting" problem; after it was acknowledged that some part-timers were teaching more than a regular departmental load, part-time teaching was restricted to two courses a term. Yet the number of instructors teaching full-time elsewhere and carrying courses at Pitt as an "overload" suggests an absurdity in the two-course limit. Indeed, this limit now seems to be only a hypocritical attempt to mask the fact of exploitation.

It is remarkable to observe the high level of responsibility and teaching quality which somehow survives despite the degradation of part-time employment. The conditions under which the part-time instructor works are discouraging even to the most dedicated and insulting to anyone with a modicum of respect for his ability. Part-time teachers are marginal, expendable, underprivileged, and underpaid. They have no assurance of employment from one term to the next, and the large turnover each year is partly explained by the fact that those hired for fall are not kept on in winter because of the annual drop in composition enrollment. Because part-timers are voiceless and alienated, few are aware of their situation. No one seems to know who the part-timers are, and they often do not know each other. Some advances have been made: part-timers have been given departmental mailboxes, access to office space (by special arrangements), and the right to a small role in department decision-making. But because the university shows so little commitment to them, part-timers are not encouraged to participate in department business.

The greatest insult to the part-time instructor is the pitifully inadequate salary for part-time teaching. (Although each of our full-time colleagues in the department received a 7.5% increment recently, and some received additional "merit" raises, part-time teachers were excluded from that pay increase and a promised raise has not materialized.) For at least seven years the salary for the English part-time instructor with a Ph.D. has not changed: it is still $1,000 per course. The salary for those with the M.A. has gone from $750 to $800. Since, at a casual estimate, the cost of living has almost doubled in the last seven years, it is clear that the part-timer's salary has reached the poverty level. But when any suggestion is made to raise it to a level comparable to that of a faculty member receiving $12,000 per year (which would mean $1,500 per course for part-timers with the Ph.D.), the mere mention of the sum required for such an increment is enough to quell further discussion. A problem of equal importance is that the part-timer is not eligible for medical or retirement benefits, which reduces the part-time salary even further when compared with that of the regular faculty.

Not regarded as "real" members of the English department, paid so little that even limited domestic help or child care would require a large portion of the part-timer's pay, receiving nothing of the financial support available to regular faculty, and lacking the leisure or the opportunity for contact with their colleagues, those part-time teachers who would like to advance themselves find it difficult to enrich their knowledge or to undertake independent research and writing—requirements for the display of excellence in the profession. Thus they are caught in the old double bind: part-time instructors cannot advance themselves, often, by the very nature of their employment. Yet the fact is that most part-timers work extremely hard—ask anyone who knows how much labor is involved in the conscientious teaching of composition—and most perform great feats of juggling with their time commitments. Should these be the working conditions for instructors who teach almost half the undergraduate English courses taught at Pitt? Are these conditions under which anyone should work? Are we willing to take action to correct this situation even though it may mean "unfeathering" some of our own nests?

Unless one really believes that part-time teaching is analogous to polite volunteerism for which a token honorarium is paid, and unless one is willing to accept a situation in the university comparable to the most reprehensible industrial exploitation—one might imagine a garment factory with a few clean and prosperous employees in the front room and a crowded sweatshop hidden in the back—we are compelled to reorder our budget priorities and to give the part-time teacher a salary and working conditions demanded by simple human decency. As matters stand, we have in the English department two kinds of faculty, and the part-timer clearly belongs to the second class. Are undergraduate English courses, likewise, divided into two classes? Does the university bulletin present the unknowing applicant with an accurate description of the English faculty? The list of the members of the English faculty should be followed by this note: "This list represents teachers of only 29% of the total number of undergraduate English courses offered during the fall term 1974."

Part-Timers Seek Collegial Support*

(Letter written by Elizabeth Segel, Chairperson of Committee on Part-Time Faculty, Department of English)

An Open Letter to Faculty and Staff:

In the last issue of the University Times, you may have read about the large body of underpaid part-time faculty in the English department. We hope you will support us in our demands for fair payment for our work.

Part-time faculty members were excluded from the cost-of-living increment received recently by full-time English faculty and other university employees, and we have received no assurances that we will share next year in the $5.3 million requested by the Chancellor for "an average 10 percent salary increase plus fringe benefits for all employees, including teaching assistants" (U-TIMES, 17 Oct. 1974).

We cannot accept as valid the explanations for our exclusion offered by the Provost and Dean Rosenberg. The Provost says, "There is no money"; yet from each of the 134 sections of English taught by a part-timer (paid $800-$1,000 with no fringe benefits) the university realizes significantly greater profit than from other sections, since those enrolled are paying the same amount of tuition as their fellow-students being taught by "regular" faculty. What money was available, Provost Smith explains, went for salary increases for full-time faculty, judged a more urgent need. No one would deny the urgency of raises for any group of employees in these inflationary times, yet surely the implication that money for adequate part-time salaries can be obtained only at the expense of our full-time colleagues is ridiculous. We must reject administrative attempts to set us at each other's throats over a few scraps out of Pitt's $150 million budget.

Dean Rosenberg's justification of our exclusion from the increment on the grounds that our salaries, unlike all others at Pitt, are admittedly "token" salaries is indefensible. We have no intention of candy-striping for Pitt. Many of us are trying to support ourselves in the work we have been well and extensively trained to do. But financial need is clearly beside the point. We are qualified people, screened each term by a group of full-time colleagues. Most of us staff an essential service to the university, the composition program, or the distinguished advanced writing program; others teach the same literature courses as our full-time colleagues.

Some would justify the exploitation of part-time teachers on the grounds that they are not good enough to get "real" jobs. If this ever was true, it has long ceased to be so. Here and elsewhere, the growing body of part-time faculty is largely composed of three groups: (1) writers who are also teachers of writing and must divide their time between writing and teaching; (2) well-qualified married women who cannot go where jobs are (some who would prefer to work full-time if they could find such a job in the Pittsburgh area, others who prefer part-time work as the best way of balancing the time demands of career and young children); and (3) recent Ph.D.'s and M.A.'s whose qualifications would have assured them of good jobs in any job market but the current one. We ask your support on three matters:

1. Fair pay. This means $1,500/course for Ph.D.'s, based on an assistant professor's load and salary (in English: 3 courses plus 1 course equivalent in released time for such things as committee work per term; $12,000 salary for two terms). Pay for those with M.A.'s or equivalent qualifications would be at least $1,200/course. Part-time faculty also must be included in all cost-of-living and merit increases available to regular faculty and in hospitalization and retirement benefits. (The great majority of us are not "temporary" employees, but are rehired every term, year after year.)

2. Regularization of qualified part-time faculty. We ask that the faculty move to sever from the controversial Tenure Commission Report Section III B-D, which would make possible half-time appointments to the core faculty. These provisions were "applauded" by the Senate Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom in its report of October 8. Out of our committee's study of the part-time phenomenon, however, we see a weakness of these provisions. Although they make possible regularization of fully qualified part-time faculty, they do nothing to move the university away from large-scale reliance on "irregular," underpaid part-timers—a tempting alternative to the appointment, promotion, and tenure of regular

* From University Times (University of Pittsburgh), 27 November 1974.

faculty in times of tight money. Such appointments are authorized in Section III C: "Temporary Appointments." Our committee suggests that the terms "temporary" and "occasional" be defined explicitly as a maximum of two terms. At the end of two consecutive terms, a person holding a temporary appointment as lecturer may not be rehired unless offered an appointment to the core faculty or an adjunct appointment (Section III D 4). With this addition, we endorse these proposals and urge the faculty to enact them as soon as possible.

3. Inclusion of part-time faculty in proposed bargaining units. We believe that, should a union win an election as the faculty bargaining agent at Pitt, any settlement that ignores the existence and needs of these members of our profession will be valueless as long as the university is free to subvert a contract by relying increasingly on "irregular," "temporary," exploited faculty.

Committee on Part-Time Faculty
English Department

P.S. We have been unable to obtain from the university a listing of part-time faculty in other departments and schools. It would help to know who and where you are, fellow part-timers. Please drop a line to Elizabeth Segel or Jane Flanders, English Department.

Yale Proposal to Regularize Part-Time Appointments—1972

1. Part-Time Appointments: General

Yale, in common with other universities, has for many years made part-time appointments to its various faculties. These appointments usually, although not always, have been as lecturer or at one of the professorial ranks but with the qualifying status of visiting or adjunct. In several of the professional schools, there have been occasional exceptions, with a full-time title being conferred upon persons with part-time appointments. In all schools, persons holding part-time appointments were not considered eligible for tenure. Individuals appointed to part-time positions also have not been eligible for a number of the fringe benefits which Yale offers to its full-time employees; conversely, persons on part-time appointments have not been subject to the restrictions on outside employment which, in general, is prohibited to full-time employees.

The conditions and procedures set forth below are intended to make it possible for some individuals to serve part-time in the regular academic ranks and to become eligible for tenure in one of the university faculties. (Conditions of employment and fringe benefit eligibility for persons holding part-time appointments other than as instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are set forth in the Faculty Handbook of the university and in policies developed in the ten university faculties.)

2. Part-Time Appointments: Definition and Purpose

Part-time appointments may be made at the ranks of instructor and assistant, associate, and full professor in accord with the normal procedures for these ranks. Part-time appointments are intended to allow those faculty members with family commitments or health circumstances that make it difficult for them to work full-time to request an appointment, or a reduction in appointment, to part-time but not less than one-half time.

"Part-time" shall be interpreted to mean part-time not only with respect to teaching, but also with respect to research and to other faculty responsibilities, including committee work and other administrative obligations. A full-time faculty appointment includes the expectation that the individual will meet normal teaching and other obligations as a member of the department and of the university, and still have approximately one-half time available for research. The individual who holds a part-time appointment will be expected to devote half of the usual amount of time not only to teaching, but also to research and the obligations of faculty citizenship.

3. Part-Time Appointments: Terms and Conditions of Appointments

Part-time appointments at the professorial ranks will be made as a percentage of full-time (not less than 50%) continuing throughout the academic year. Appointments will not ordinarily be made on a one-term-on-full-time, one-term-off basis. Persons holding part-time appointments within the tenure system may not accept employment outside the university except as specified in the Faculty Handbook for full-time employees.

Appointments to part-time status will be made only when such an arrangement is mutually advantageous to the department and to the faculty member. In any given year, no more than a small proportion of the faculty in any department or school should hold part-time appointments.

The recommendation to use a position on a part-time basis shall require the vote of the appropriate governing body in a department or school. In the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, a chairman should forward the recommendation to the Provost who may seek the advice of the Executive Committee. In the Professional Schools, the Dean should forward the recommendation to the Provost.

4. Part-Time Appointments: Expectations concerning Subsequent Adjustment of the Proportion of Time

Since part-time status within the tenure system normally will be temporary, tentative agreement should be sought concerning the anticipated date of return to full-time status; this will facilitate departmental budgetary planning. The funds that become available in the department budget by converting a full-time position to part-time shall remain available to the department for other purposes. These funds normally shall be used only for short-term appointments, including, for example, teaching fellows or part-time acting instructors. Limiting the use of funds released by part-time appointments to short-term appointments will insure the feasibility of the conversion of part-time to full-time positions.

Occasionally, a person who is a candidate for a part-time appointment may not be able to specify when he or she will become available for full-time employment. In that case, the proportion of time specified at the outset of the appointment will apply to that appointment until continuing resources become available to increase the proportion of time.

In recommending a candidate for a part-time appointment, the standards and process of evaluation shall be independent of the proportion of time proposed. Should a change subsequently occur in the proportion of time, a second review will not take place.

5. Part-Time Appointments within the Tenure System: Extension of Term in Rank

Faculty members who hold, or have held, part-time faculty appointments at the ranks of instructor, and assistant or associate professor on term will be allowed an extension in their existing term in rank if they request it. The total of such extensions shall not exceed the difference between the faculty member's part-time accumulated service at Yale and a normal full-time term of appointment. Normally, however, the total of such extensions shall not exceed three years. Any requests for extension of the term of appointment must be submitted to the chairman of the department and the dean of the school before January 1 of the year preceding the final academic year of appointment. Extensions beyond the limit of three years will require the written approval of the appropriate dean and the Provost, who may seek the advice of the appropriate appointments committee.

6. Part-Time Appointments within the Tenure System: Leaves and Benefits

a. Leaves without salary: Faculty members holding part-time appointments shall be eligible for leaves of absence without salary on the same basis as persons holding full-time appointments in those ranks.

b. Leaves with salary: Faculty members holding part-time appointments shall be eligible for leaves of absence with salary on the same basis as persons holding full-time appointments in those ranks. The salary paid during the leave shall be in proportion to the average fraction of full-time spent in the individual's appointment during the period creating eligibility for the leave. Thus, for example, an associate professor on half-time shall become eligible for a triennial leave of absence with half-time salary in the third year following the initial appointment as associate professor. Junior faculty in the Arts and Sciences who hold a part-time appointment will be eligible to compete for Morse and Junior Faculty Fellowship leaves. The amount of the fellowship award will be in proportion to the time taught in the previous year.

c. Summer compensation: Faculty members holding part-time appointments shall be eligible for the summer stipend under the conditions specified in the Faculty Handbook for persons holding full-time appointments in those ranks. The amount of the stipend will be in proportion to the fraction of full-time to be taught in the next academic year.

d. Travel grant: Faculty members holding part-time appointments shall be eligible for the $300 travel grant under the same terms as faculty holding full-time appointments in those ranks.

e. Retirement Plan: Faculty members holding part-time appointments of not less than half-time in the ranks of assistant, associate, or full professor shall be eligible for the Faculty Retirement Plan as outlined in the By-Laws of the Yale Corporation. Faculty members with tenure are required to participate in the plan.

f. Health Plan: Faculty members holding part-time appointments at not less than one-half time shall be eligible for enrollment in the Yale Health Plan and other medical and insurance plans on the same basis as faculty holding full-time appointments in those ranks.

However, persons with part-time appointments cannot be enrolled in the university's disability plan, which is limited by contract to full-time employees.

g. Mortgage Loan: Faculty members holding part-time appointments in the ranks of assistant, associate, or full professor shall be eligible for the Mortgage Loan Plan providing they can meet all other criteria expected of a person holding a full-time position.

h. Group Life Insurance: Faculty members holding part-time appointments of not less than half-time in the ranks of instructor, and assistant, associate, or full professor and whose appointments are for a minimum of twelve months are eligible for the Group Life Insurance Plan.

The Great Role Change: Or, Trying to Remain an Academic Couple

Suzanne and Joseph Juhasz

In 1973 Suzanne and Joseph Juhasz decided to try the Great Role Change. He was then assistant professor of psychology at Bucknell University; she was, had been, and was likely to remain a temporary, part-time lecturer in English at the same institution. She was also (the two situations being intimately related) a faculty wife. They hoped that their professional positions might become more equitable if he "followed" her, rather than vice versa. At present Suzanne is in her first year as assistant professor of English at the University of Colorado, Boulder; Joseph is assistant professor in a half-time job in the University of Colorado College of Environmental Design.

This essay is an attempt to document the "before" and the "after" of the Great Role Change from the point of view of both participants. We believe that the situation of the academic couple needs to be publicized; we want to contribute our experiences and insights toward that process. Public awareness is necessary to foster change, and change seems essential.

Presently, the academic couple as we conceive of ourselves—two seriously professional academics married to one another—is a union unacceptable in our society. Historically, the society has put pressure on such a couple either to focus on one career at the expense of the other or to divorce. The secondary or noncareer has usually belonged to the wife. Coming out of graduate school with husband and Ph.D., she has traditionally either traded in the degree for babies or worked in some fashion that would not interfere with her husband's professionalism. Or, in order to advance her own career, she and he have divorced. Nepotism rules were the expression of profound societal attitudes toward married academics; although the overt nepotism rules are now illegal, the covert attitudes remain. This essay describes our attempts to fight against such attitudes.

I

Suzanne:

When I received my Ph.D. in English from Berkeley in 1970, I was not prepared for the discrimination I would encounter for the next three years in trying to work in my profession. Naively, I thought that the apprenticeship I had served—an especially difficult Ph.D. program undergone as the mother of one, then two, and finally three children, as wife and housewife to boot—was my ticket to my chosen field. I hadn't counted on the job market, I hadn't counted on sexism, and, most particularly, I had entirely underestimated and misunderstood the antinepotism sentiment that prevailed in the academic world.

I was a "faculty wife" because I had married a man of intelligence equal to my own, had gone to graduate school as he had done, had accompanied him, while I was writing my dissertation, to the university that had hired him. Being a faculty wife, I tried to find employment in the geographical area where I lived, which contained one "good school" (where my husband was employed) and several institutions of lesser quality. Naturally (?), it was assumed by everyone that, if I must work (most people could not even understand that imperative), I would do so at one of the latter schools. Yet for three years, these places would never hire me, for reasons such as the following--I quote from a chairman's letter: (a) "we would rather hire a young person who was not placed at all, that is, someone who didn't already have a breadwinner in the family (I knew that you were married to a Bucknell professor)"; (b) "Your very impressive competencies would have no scope here at all."

Bucknell University (presently the object of a class-action discrimination suit, which I and two other women instituted) was more subtle in its dealings with me. For three of the five terms I was in residence there, its English department employed me: as part-time, temporary lecturer to teach Freshman English. Each year I applied for the position or positions that were open on the assistant professor level; each year I was not only not chosen but was never taken seriously as a candidate. Only gradually did I come to understand this attitude toward me.

The first year I applied (fall 1970), I was briefly interviewed by the department chairman and one other member of the committee on hiring and retention. The hasty meeting was conducted while I was recovering from double strep/pneumonia and immediately before we left for New Zealand for a term. The reason given for this abbreviated version of the usual day-long

interviewing process was my weakened condition. Nevertheless, that meeting must go on record as my only formal interview at Bucknell; indeed, it was the only discussion of my professional interests and opinions that I ever had with a member of the department of English! I did not get the position but was offered a fall semester lectureship for 1971. I thought of this as a "trial run": a chance for the department to come to know me, see how good I was. No one else had any such idea.

When I applied for a position in 1971, I had no official response to my letter but was led to believe by the chairman that I was being considered for it. Until a candidate was brought to the campus, interviewed, and immediately offered the job. What about me, I asked the chairman? I then learned two vital facts from him. One, that my presence on the campus was no asset. In his opinion, no applicant could be given special treatment: all of the dossiers were "laid on the table" and evaluated with impartial objectivity. Two, Bucknell, he said, had used to have to hire faculty wives; but now, with its raised standards of excellence, it no longer had to do so. At last I understood the rather diabolical double bind in which I struggled. Faculty wives were by definition inferior: since colleagues were equal, their wives, inferior to them, must be inferior professionals. Special treatment meant doing someone (your colleague) a favor. On the other hand, objective evaluation was impossible when one did in fact already "know" the applicant, from parties and dinners where she was encountered as a colleague's wife.

In a long letter to the committee on hiring and retention, I asked to be interviewed so that they might come to know me as a professional person. I also asked that, rather than hiring by rigid specialty specifications, they consider my availability to the department (especially since they themselves were a large undergraduate department of nonspecialists). Their answer was as follows: you are not a major candidate for the position.

The story goes on and on. The details of the following years' hiring become increasingly bizarre (and too complicated for this telling of the tale); in fact, the department seemed to be going out of its way to create and alter its employment situation to exclude me, as at the same time I was becoming more and more visible and vocal in my protests. For I had started organizing.

For a long time, the effects of this kind of treatment were very damaging to me. Professionally, my temporary lectureship brought with it accompanying nonprivileges: a lower rank and pay than that for which I was qualified; no opportunity to teach at a mid-level or advanced level; lack of professional facilities and privileges; no job security; service that did not count toward tenure; no opportunity for advancement. Most important, I think, was the fact that I was consistently treated by members of "my" department as a noncolleague; that is, part-time temporary help. Emotionally, I was in a state of self-doubt and conflict. My graduate school had treated me as a superior scholar; in my present environment I was treated either as a complete professional nonentity (a faculty wife) or as a spoiled child with delusions of grandeur who was forever attempting to take up the valuable time of professionals with her requests and complaints, a child to be treated with amused contempt. It was difficult not to believe them, for they were a confident establishment, while I was alone and unsure to boot. I became depressed and despondent, accumulating an internal file of anxiety, pain, and hurt.

It was when I started reading, about the women's movement in general but specifically about other academic women whose sufferings sounded horrifyingly like my own, that I began to realize the nature of my oppression, began to organize the demand for affirmative action on the campus, began to speak out publicly, began to fight back. I became "that feminist," notorious in Lewisburg, Pa., and I knew that I would never work again at Bucknell. Yet because I (and others who fought with me) had been pushed too far, political consciousness came to Bucknell. For me personally, the most important moment was the day in the spring of 1972 when I faced a department meeting and told them what I thought they had done to me and how I felt about it, a statement that I subsequently wrote down and sent to the president, dean, provost, and chairman; thereafter (after no response at all from anyone) to HEW.

Through this long period my husband Joseph was at first my sole support, and afterward (when my women's group was formed and functioning), my major support. He believed me, he defended me, he bore the burden and the brunt of my confusion, depression, anger, and doubt. Whatever strength I had came from his belief that I had strength. He followed me, as "faculty husband," to Boulder when I began my first regular appointment as assistant professor of English.

Joseph:

The three years during which Suzanne was unable to find suitable work were for me years of considerable professional recognition. I was finding myself a center of intellectual activity among colleagues, students, and people outside campus. In the beginning it was impossible to understand that Suzanne was not able to find a job; later I assigned the reason to political

enemies of my own on campus. I thought that people were getting even with me by denying a job to my wife. I then began to work politically against these enemies to have Suzanne hired. It was only much later that I began to think that Suzanne's being a faculty wife had anything to do with her lack of success. When that realization came, I began to feel open contempt for many of my colleagues, tended to lambast them both publicly and privately (particularly the more "liberal" friends on the English faculty), and began to lobby openly with the higher-ups in the administration who I thought were my friends and/or my political allies.

All this came to nothing. I felt a lot of sympathy for and identification with faculty women and other women professionals and became one of their "champions"—in retrospect this was probably done somewhat patronizingly, from a position of power, privilege, and advantage. It was the Superior Person making room for Deserving Inferiors; rather like a Rockefeller championing open recruitment for the Chase Manhattan Bank. I also began to feel, privately, some guilt over my own successes—did I have them merely because I was a man, were they taking place over Suzanne's dead body?

During this time friends were assuring me that I should be leaving Central Pennsylvania; I should be moving to a metropolitan area. They had friends where husbands were teaching at Swarthmore and the wife at St. Joe's, or Harvard and Leslie College; or Berkeley and Hayward State; or Chicago and an unnamed JC, and so on. I was getting more and more befuddled at the inert state of friends' consciousnesses; their inability to even attempt to face and solve problems in their own world; and my inability to make things easy and simple for my wife: after all, a husband's first duty.

I eventually came to the conclusion that our only hope was for Suzanne to go on the open job market; I would follow her. I would lay on her no need to bargain for me with any university. Since discrimination was against women, I would have less difficulty in finding a job than she had. In any case it was her "turn"—I had had a lot of recognition and prestige; Suzanne was clearly entitled to the same. I also told myself that I was not such a tremendously job-oriented person, and I could easily get along for two or three years on minimally rewarding work, after which, undoubtedly, water would seek its own level.

II

Suzanne:

Things began to change for me in February of 1974, when I accepted my job at Colorado. Already I began to feel more confident and positive. After school started in the fall, this new sense of myself expanded rapidly. In the beginning, when people would come up to me and treat me as a professor (respect, I think, defines this attitude), I would internally look over my shoulder to see whom they were talking to! With three and a half years of teaching experience, I had nonetheless never been treated as "real" before. I began to treat myself as real, too. It is important to point out here the distinction I felt between this job and other professional achievements. In 1974 I had published a book (a full-length critical study), an article, and poems. I had read a paper at a national conference and given several papers and colloquia on campus. I was not a professional nonentity; nevertheless, the job (the regular, full-time, ladder position) made all the difference, in the eyes of others and myself.

Changes have occurred this year. Some of them have been caused by the external demands of the job: meetings, committees, and other campus commitments beyond teaching itself that are unknown to temporary and part-time workers. I have three children, thus many "private" responsibilities. Though I have always worked, my hours on campus have always been fewer than now: less late afternoons, evenings. Child-care arrangements (involving day care center, babysitter, and, of course, Joseph) have had to shift. I have spent less time cooking (an old love and skill). All this has caused conflicts about the sharing of household responsibilities (we've always shared), simply because public responsibilities have changed. We have had to do a great deal of reallotting and redefining: feelings get hurt on both sides during such a process.

Other changes have taken place: internal ones, stemming from my new assessment of myself. I treat myself differently. I pay more attention to my needs and desires. I now think that I am entitled to them. Before, although I pushed and struggled, a part of me believed that I was getting from society what I deserved. I had heard too often: "Why do you want a job? You have three children," the implication being that I didn't deserve to have my cake and eat it, too. No woman likes to be told that she is selfish; she wants to be selfless. That makes her a real woman. Well, I want to be a real person, and I am trying to be selfish. I don't mean no longer thinking of others; I mean thinking of myself as I would of others—as someone who has important needs and desires.

I know that this attitude toward myself has fostered the professional success (at the job and beyond it) that I have been experiencing. A new sense of power has been added to my other

competencies. I like what I am able to do, for myself and others.

What complicates the situation is that my self-esteem has had to coincide with a period of low esteem for Joseph. It is difficult for him to do what he has done, in ways neither of us had anticipated. He is angry, hurt, and fearful. His anger, hurt, fear are different from what I have experienced but nonetheless real. Surely, he is doing "better" in his first year as faculty husband than I had ever done in my years as faculty wife; but then, he is both more senior professionally than I was and he is a man—both having created a stronger ego, stronger sense of self and self-importance than I ever knew.

Now, many of the ground rules of our marriage itself are undergoing change. They were created during a time when needs and desires were radically different. But we have been married twelve years and have known each other for seventeen: our patterns are well established. Yet many of them don't quite work these days. We remain committed to one another both as husband and wife and as fellow professionals, and often we experience strong conflict because these commitments seem to work against one another.

Joseph:

My job search in the spring of 1974 began auspiciously: the University of Colorado was looking for a social psychologist for a one-year appointment. Having just turned down a position at the psychology department at Berkeley to be able to do the Great Role Change, I felt confident that I would at least be considered for the job. I received no response to my inquiry, and when we decided to come to look for a house in Boulder in April, I called up the department and was offered an interview. I had an interesting conversation with an elderly gentleman of some local reputation, and two others with persons who were openly bored—one walked out on me after five minutes. In June I received a printed, unsigned form letter from the department which stated that "the job for which you were recommended or for which you have applied has been filled." I later found out that the position was filled by a person who was a brand new Ph.D. with no previous teaching experience or publications.

I then decided to approach every school within a two-hour commuting distance and ask for any kind of work whatsoever from any department that might conceivably employ a psychologist. I had interviews at such places as University of Northern Colorado, Colorado State University, Colorado Women's College, and Metropolitan State College. I also applied for advertised jobs at junior colleges.

The personal reactions I encountered seemed largely to be mixtures of open or closed fear, contempt, wonder, hostility, and har-har backslapping; some persons reacted to me very positively as a person and even with a touch of envy and admiration for my "situation." There was general appreciation of my experience, publications, etc. All responses for June, July, and August, our first three months at Boulder, were that either there were no jobs, or that I was "overqualified" (a remarkable concept, given the fact that I was applying for whatever could be had, even part-time work), or that whatever jobs there were were not in my speciality. My own reaction toward myself was increased confusion, resentment toward Suzanne, and inability to work. Despite my paper qualifications, I had become a pariah—people could not even articulate their own derision at my unmasculine "role change." They knew that there had to be something wrong with an accomplished professional searching for a job in a limited area, with a man who would compromise his career for his wife's, but they did not have a ready word for his condition.

Two experiences stand out from this period. One was a short interview with the chairman of the psychology department at the University of Colorado. He did not ask me to sit down, did not stand to receive me, and played with his false teeth while I talked. He clearly felt that I was beneath his notice. Although consciously it was easy for me to dismiss him as a pig, he had deeply offended me, and besides there was always the lingering possibility that he had assessed me correctly.

The other encounter was at our house. The chairman of the recruitment committee of the sociology department responded to my query about possible jobs by saying that they would only consider women or members of minority groups for whatever openings might occur. I asked him if he were willing to resign his position on this noble principle and thereby open hiring to women or minority group members who otherwise might not be able to find jobs; or, alternatively, whether he would be willing to have his credentials evaluated against mine "in the blind" and resign his job if I had superior qualifications. He interpreted psychologically by saying that he was glad to know how I felt. I told him that I was not talking about my feelings (though bruised) but about my thoughts and that I was thinking that he was a hypocrite. He agreed that he was being hypocritical, assured me that he was happy to know how I felt, and hastily departed. I had a feeling that I had "blown it," and also a strange feeling that I did not care.

These two incidents are meant to illustrate reactions from "conservatives" and "liberals," my own growing desperation, and the beginning of my realization that I no longer had to carry

the entire world on my shoulders—four innocent lives did not depend on my support—Suzanne's income was sufficient to carry the family.

This was a shattering realization: I no longer had to do everything, smooth out all paths, pretend to be invulnerable and unaffected. I could display some weakness. I could blow up at a hypocrite. I could make demands on Suzanne for support and sympathy. None of these were possibilities when I was the Breadwinner. Making adjustments that tended to undermine my image and self-image of omnipotence were immensely painful for me and Suzanne, for we had both grown to rely on it. We both slipped into moments of derision; I had visions of myself as Lear or as Strindberg's The Father; Suzanne seemed to me at times to play the complementary role. Still, this capacity for feeling and fallibility (to be other than God the Father) is perhaps the most positive aspect of the Great Role Change for me personally. I am not sure that it is or was worth the price in bruised feelings and humiliation, but I am sure that it involves both potential and actual personal growth.

My personal contacts with Suzanne's colleagues were very disturbing. Used to being the center of intellectual attention, I found it inexplicable and disturbing that people paid little attention to what I said.

At the beginning of the fall I was offered (and took) a one-half time position at the College of Environmental Design here, at Boulder. The pay was less than one third of my previous year's salary. I also found an opportunity to teach one course at Colorado Women's College and at the University of Denver for each of the semesters at about one fifteenth of my previous year's salary per course. My colleagues at Environmental Design have remained courteous, appreciative, and warm, and seem to respect me; I have been slowly developing friendships with some of the more "liberal" faculty. As of this writing I have no position whatsoever for the next academic year.

At this point it is time to tell an anecdote. I was recounting some of these experiences quite recently to a woman acquaintance at a party. Her reaction was: "So what—women have been through this for the past fifty years." I did not respond, but found the exchange very embittering. In my present situation I find no comfort whatsoever in her professional sufferings, nor do I propose to do reparations either for my own past sins or those of others. To find myself in the position of being discriminated against has been to find out that this society works on a system of privilege and that neither the women's nor any other "movement" has seriously tackled this as a problem. (Not that I know how to tackle it.) If I continue to operate in the privilege system, I have the choice of speaking up and making myself persona non grata (as Suzanne had at Bucknell), or I can continue to hope against hope that I will be perceived as a Good Nigger. If I speak up (publicly, to my colleagues, not Suzanne's as here) it will mean that we will have to move again and Suzanne will have to give up her job; I know that I am not convincing as the Good Nigger. It is much the same problem that Suzanne and other faculty wives have faced for the past fifty years.

III

In trying to exist as an academic couple we have both experienced difficulty and discrimination. For Suzanne it was the discrimination classically encountered by the powerless; for Joseph it is the discrimination against a member of a privileged group who has spoiled his identity. Although the effect is similar, it is qualitatively different both in its application and in how it is experienced by the two of us. Suzanne is working herself into something; Joseph suddenly finds himself outside what he has always taken to be his birthright.

We don't know whether we will live happily ever after; we do know that we are still trying. We continue to remain committed to both our marriage and our careers: we are endeavoring to remain an academic couple in spite of nepotism practice. What we have learned thus far and want to communicate to others is that there is just so much that we can accomplish as super-couple (which we, in fact, aren't). We live in a society and need to change it if what we and other academic couples are trying to accomplish can ever become a satisfying reality for more than the exceptional cases. We hope that more widespread understanding of who we are and what we want can lead toward the changes that are imperative.

Can Two Enormous Ambitions Live Together?

Dorin Schumacher

(Paper presented at the MLA Commission on the Status of Women Workshop, "Careers and Couples," Modern Language Association, Dec. 27, 1974.)

What I will deal with in this paper is nothing I can step away from, be objective about, or examine as an academician. The kinds of problems women face regarding their identities as wives, mothers, and working professionals are problems I am living through, and I cannot subject them to the kind of analysis necessary for an academic tone. I want to tell you about me, for all women are something of me, and I am something of all women. I have tried to combine a couple relationship and a career--and failed. It was a combination for which neither my parents nor social conditioning had prepared me. My hopes are that, with different assumptions, it might succeed.

How can two enormous ambitions live together? The question suggests more than simply two persons in competition in one household; it suggests, too, the internal conflicts of need and desire within one person. The conflicts are those of decision-making and dominance, both between persons and within the self. Incredible strains are placed on the relationship; it is the stuff of which schizophrenia is made. One longs for the comfort of stereotypic roles, the security of tradition, the feeling that one has found solid ground on which to plant one's feet. But in today's changing world the old masks are ripped away, and one stands exposed in emotional disarray, forced to create the new rather than simply adopt the old.

When I registered to take a couple of undergraduate summer school courses in 1961, after having been married for five years, I had no idea that I was embarking on fourteen years of dramatic personal change that included graduate school, fellowships, teaching honors, a Ph.D., scholarly publications, the break-up of my seventeen-year-old marriage, and now a position as manager of a $121,000 educational program. In 1961 I was a housewife and mother of preschool children, a college drop-out, trying to find something more meaningful to do with my time than sitting alone in a graduate student apartment and watching my two toddlers spit Gerber's baby food back at me faster than I could push it in.

Through these past years, there was developing in me, slowly and almost imperceptibly, another--and different--self. Influenced not only by my inner needs, but also by the forces of history swirling around me, I have sought this change. To paraphrase Rollo May, "Woman becomes a self only as she participates in her development and throws her weight behind this c[hoice] that tendency no matter how limited this choice may be. The self never develops automatically; woman becomes a self only to the extent that she can know it, affirm it, assert it."[1]

But in the process of changing, in my becoming, which has been a breaking away from old attitudes, feelings, behaviors and a learning of new ones, I have undergone a series of major life crises which I now see as necessary to this growth process. It is as though an old self dies and a new self is born each time, phoenixlike, through a period of turmoil and intense struggle.

As I reflect on my experience, three major crises seem to stand out. The first was an inner one, occurring during my graduate school years. I began to experience feelings of strain and tension, periods of depression and psychic pain, grief as though someone I loved had died. The anxiety I felt was threatening to paralyze me. I was in the grip of something I could not understand. I worked this crisis through in counseling, discovering that I was experiencing a direct conflict between my image of femininity and my image of intellect and achievement. To me, then, mind was masculine and grotesque in a woman. Intellectual assertiveness was defeminizing. I was terrified of my own intellect and my drive for success and achievement. Working through this, I was slowly able to recognize the nature of the conflict and to integrate these very strong aspects of myself: my identity as a woman and as a competent and striving intellectual. It is only because I was able to achieve this integration that I completed graduate school. A very important part of my professional identity was forged through this process and I have been building upon this base ever since.

Since the stereotypic images of femininity and masculinity are opposites and professionalism is associated with the image of masculinity, a woman, in order to succeed professionally, must have or must develop the attributes of maleness and male achievement: independence, drive, dedication, objectivity, assertiveness. If she can succeed in integrating these male elements with the feminine elements in her--her emotionality, her service to others, cooperativeness, sensitivity to relationship, and concern for internal development--she will have achieved a higher stage of maturity and growth and can leave inner strain and conflict behind. She will not have to waste her emotional energies in denial or failure.

In my readings, I have come across many discussions of role conflict, of stereotypes, of role strain, but relatively little that discusses resolution of conflict, the integrating of conflicting elements within the self or within a relationship, little that shows how to go through conflict and move beyond it to a higher level of development. One is often left with the impression that to be an achieving woman one must live a life of precarious balance, caught between a crossfire of conflicting role demands. The following selections are representative of this point of view: "In fact, women who today choose both marriage and a career face a nearly normless situation in that no formal structure or expectations exist to aid them in apportioning time and resources between their two major responsibilities. Ability to deal with the complex roles of wife, mother, working woman, especially at the professional level, is still largely a matter of individual adaptation, compromise, and personal arrangement, often characterized by strain." "Much of the strain experienced by the woman who attempts to work is structured strain, caused by a combination of an overdemanding set of role obligations, lack of consensus as to the hierarchy of obligations, and the clash of obligations from home and occupational statuses."[2] The "girl who maintains qualities of independence and active striving (achievement orientation) necessary for intellectual mastery defies the conventions of sex-appropriate behavior and must pay 'a price in anxiety.'"[3]

What I derive from these readings is that women have a Hobson's choice between the traditional role of staying barefoot and pregnant in the kitchen or of balancing two or three major roles and living a life of unresolved conflicts, as exhausting and destructive within the self as in a relationship. This, it seems to me, is more than we can reasonably expect or even allow to be the case for women. I think that the situation is both worse and better than these writers have described it. The conflicts are more severe than the writers indicate and they must be dealt with somehow. My own experience has been that very serious and violent conflict insists upon some resolution, even though the resolution may be a hard and painful one.

I could have managed the conflict I felt between femininity and intellect by leaving graduate school and returning to a traditional wife-mother role. I could have denied the demands of my intellectual self; perhaps I could even have denied the conflict, for a while. In either case, the price to be paid is high.

My second major crisis was the crisis in my marriage, a crisis within a relationship: the career-couple conflict. It began as I was nearing the end of writing my dissertation and lasted until some months after the time of the divorce, two years later. It is curious to me that my marriage did not break up earlier when I stepped out of my kitchen and went back to school; but perhaps that is because the student role and the wife and mother roles are congruent. The student is not economically or intellectually independent, and studying can be done at home; not too much time is spent in class. When I finished my dissertation and began to teach, to experience the rewards of professional success, my marriage began to break up. The surface issue seemed to be the question of where we would live and work, how we would decide, what compromises had to be made and by whom. But another issue which later became clearer was that of my changing expectations of the marriage, which occurred simultaneously with my new concept of myself as a professional.

I found then that I could not combine the professional role with the wife and mother roles. When the professional role became strong enough to conflict directly with the wife role, I gave up the wife role. This increased the demands of the mother role as single parent and added the role of family head and breadwinner. But, oddly enough, I am finding more congruence among my three new roles of mother, breadwinner, professional.

I still feel, and I am not sure why, that the professional role and wife role are incompatible, at least for me. And I have struggled to understand this feeling, knowing that I have not succeeded; but I will at least give you the results of some of my attempts to understand. The three roles of wife, mother, and professional each require complete emotional commitment, an unlimited commitment of time and energy, and all contain the concept of irreplaceability and individuality: one person expressing her ego through her identity as either professional, or wife, or mother cannot be easily replaced. There is competition for a woman's available resources of self among her children, her husband, and her work, and she is limited by the twenty-four-hour day, the seven-day week, and by her own personal resources of energy.

The professional role requires and tends to develop self-confidence and autonomy as well as dominant behavior. A successful professional woman develops a more masculine identity as she becomes assertive, a leader, an authority figure. As a woman changes, her relationships to her children and to her husband change, and the success of the relationships depends on her family's willingness or ability to change with her. Also, the satisfaction a woman finds in her professional life may lessen the importance of or substitute for the satisfactions she once derived almost exclusively from her marriage relationship. She will find an identity, self-esteem, and financial support in her work, and what then will she still seek in the role of wife?

There is a risk in the knowledge of oneself and of another person, and I have in many ways paid a high price for this knowledge. I have had to learn to live alone, taking responsibility for myself and my teenage children--and, what is sometimes harder in Maine, taking care of my car in snow, in ice, and in blizzards--making major decisions and living with their consequences. I have lived through many, many nights of terror and many bleak days of anxiety about the future. At the same time, I have had to assume greater responsibilities in my work, making decisions, supervising a staff, raising and managing funds.

The third crisis, and one with which I struggle daily, is the conflict between femininity and authority. My socialization did not prepare me for supervision and management; instead, it prepared me to look up to men, to be submissive, to please others by charm, seduction, good looks, and to seek and have only emotional relationships. Now I must make decisions both popular and unpopular; hire and fire; supervise and criticize; have very real authority over people; be hired to dominate and control; compete for what I want; be surrounded by people with whom I have nothing but work in common and many of whom I don't even like; be objective; be visible; be evaluated by objective terms; experience the isolation of authority and leadership. All in one year. It is not glamorous. Every single damn day I walk into my office I experience the strain of these new role expectations and their conflict with my past conditioning.

A few things help me. One is that while crisis and conflict are never easy, they do become easier with experience. The process of change can at least become familiar, the taking of risks more possible. Because I faced my first professional crisis and grew through it, I recognize the elements of this latest one; I can better understand the sources of my strain and minimize their power over me. And when new opportunities arise, I can predict what some of the strain will be and face it without fear.

It is only through a process of risk-taking that true choices can be made and that creative possibilities can emerge. The more strength a woman develops, the less vulnerable she will be to terrible loss and to devastating fears. If she can face and resolve one conflict, she may have the courage and example to face subsequent crises.

Another thing that helps me is that modern concepts of management are androgynous, combining masculine authority with feminine concern about people and relationships. This makes it more likely that a woman who has integrated female and male attributes can successfully adapt to this professional role; as described in one management manual, "a manager is flexible, interacts with his/her subordinates, involves all members of the team in the department's activities, reviews plans with subordinates, and has a relationship with them that is much like that of a team coach with his/her players. He/she values his/her subordinates' ideas and lets them know it; he/she makes them feel involved in decision making, especially in those areas that influence their future. Yet everyone knows that he/she alone makes the final decisions and that he/she doesn't shirk his/her responsibilities."[4] The manager is then fulfilling all of his/her responsibilities: training, communicating, motivating, counseling, and providing positive leadership.

I have become, too, more at ease with my own loneliness, what Clark E. Moustakas calls in his book "an experience of being human which enables the individual to sustain, extend, and deepen her humanity . . . out of the depths of grief, despair, and the shattering feeling of total impotency springs the urge to create new forms and images and to discover unique ways of being aware and expressing experience."[5]

Now that I am a professional woman, perhaps I can build on this new central identity and redefine other roles to meet my new needs and life-style. It should be possible to integrate a career and couple relationship if the couple will face their conflict, working together to change behavior and attitudes, learning new decision-making methods and skills, and evolving a more mature relationship. I would define this as a situation of decision-making in a nonpower base where each person gains some and loses some. I believe it can be done, but it takes time and mutual commitment, and it requires that a man sacrifice to the relationship and that a woman assert and accept full equality in it.

Notes

[1] Power and Innocence: A Search for the Sources of Violence (New York: Norton, 1972), p. 141. I have taken liberties with and modified gender pronouns in this and other quotes used in my text for the purpose of making personal identification with the statements easier.

[2] Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1971), pp. 96-98, 181.

[3] Judith M. Bardwick, Psychology of Women: A Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts (New York: Harper, 1971), p. 181.

[4] Ray A. Killian, The Working Woman: A Male Manager's View (American Management Assn., 1971), p. 71.

[5] Loneliness (Prentice-Hall, 1961), pp. ix, 33.

The Married Woman Scholar

Marianne Shapiro

"Couples" have always had careers: the career of the husband sustained by the auxiliary of his wife, and not infrequently by her secretarial salary. It goes without saying that my interest in the problem and in the cruel deprivations that accrue to both the wife and the society in which she lives is not academic. I wish to see genuine change, the emergence of a social and cultural order in which as much of the range of human potential is open to women as to men. The near ubiquitousness of a secondary status for women in the overarching ideologies and deep assumptions of academe cannot be denied. Vigilance is in order; but first, readiness. In an academic couple the woman is still the marked member. My seven-year-old daughter is never asked what her mother "does"; my husband regularly travels far out of his conversational path to establish my academic status to new acquaintances, whose reactions vary from utter blankness to polite skepticism.

True, we seem to have moved into an era of apparent democratization, of attempting to dispense with social and economic distinctions, of sporting cradle-to-grave "work clothes." Though we live in the wake of a depleting war, our recent response to it has not come in the form of a spurt of procreation but as a renewed desire to limit it. The image of woman as mother has sustained some bad body blows lately. It seems that the social requirement of motherhood has been so greatly alleviated in the professional classes of our society that it can no longer serve as a screen or shield from other aspirations. The crucial confrontation is that between woman and her mate(s). I think that now is less than ever the time to speak of "sharing": don't be fooled, the sharing will be that of the husband with his wife, hardly the other way, and this seems more intensely and generally true in the humanities. For here we are dealing in old disciplines where decisions are more than usually judgmental, fields that are under constant fire from social science and technology and subject to sizable losses on all fronts of Freedom and Dignity. If there is any substance in the notion that women get just as much as men are willing to grant them by their own abdication or abstention, we should be aware that those grants may slow down again in the very near future, victims of the job crunch. Whatever our recent emendations to Western Civ, we remain painfully conscious of the place that courses in it have always kept for the Ladies. Often enough, lecturing on Penelope or Beatrice, I have an acute sense of being a traitor to my sex.

My credentials should be made clear. I teach and study in an old field, medieval and Renaissance Italian literature. I am in my middle thirties, married to my only husband, with a small daughter. We own a house in Los Angeles. For several years of my wedgeshaped career I have usually lived apart from my family where my work took me. At such times my little girl has stayed with her father, who is professor of Slavic linguistics at UCLA. I have just been promoted to associate professor (without tenure) at Yale. My husband is unable to find a position on the East Coast even nearly commensurate with the one he now holds. We make our plans by the month, and when I come home to my family I bring (along with presents) the outdoor and outside strangeness that in my early life was always the accompaniment to "Daddy's home."

This experience and that of women colleagues who live separately from their husbands and/or maintain separate residences have led me to the assumption that the key term we want is not sharing—not yet—but sacrifice, gratification deferment, the readiness to sacrifice physical comfort, not to take consortium, even sollatio, for granted; the readiness of either partner to travel wherever and whenever it is professionally advantageous to go, to stay flexible of mind in situations that most sorely try the ego (the wife's academic debut as measured, yes, measured against the husband's solid entrenchment), to spend one's money on all of the above and do so with a liberal heart. What is more, and sadder, if an academic woman is to marry she must find the mate who will join her in this program; she must choose a husband as he has always chosen a wife.

Whoever the temporarily disadvantaged partner is, there must be a readiness to accord professional and domestic advantage to that partner within the family. Self-denial becomes

ordinary but, I maintain, is not to be confused with older forms of "sharing": in actual reality, the husband's contribution may be to his wife, the wife's to herself, and even for a prolonged period. It sounds like a reversal of folkways from time immemorial, but this aspect of reversal is crucial and pervasive. An ability to ride with change is of the essence.

In terms of mundane necessity and the workaday division of time, I am referring to a basic shift of privilege. Everyone loves to hug a child and give it a toy; in our family at least, nobody loves to discipline a child or clean up after it, but we both do it. Never have I tried to persuade myself that this is other than a cultural anomaly. It may take forever to unscramble the treacherous proportions of "Nature" and "Culture" that can make the lives of married mothers a drudgery. No woman can operate at strength in a life framed by and ultimately composed of fragmentary services to others, any others. And a healthy quotient of intellectual narcissism, of the sort that helps write books, seems to be indispensable for the married academic woman. Divide the right to occasional moroseness and to extreme concentration upon research, and watch "masochism" shrink, perhaps even vanish, from her life. A subtitle for this paper could have been "The Necessity of Narcissism," if one could only un-load the word again.

Decor, or symbolic value, such as that of keeping the wife's birthname, is probably desirable if done in time. It can be the crowning glory of her use of Ms. (observe, Mr.). But the deep roots of the strong academic woman, it seems to me, lie in her ability to think of herself as first and as the only person she is sure to live her entire life with, distinct, separate, and more than this also: capable of "thrust." She need be no one's disciple, no one's research assistant, no one's scholastic sidekick, and her approach to academic or domestic problems (which I see as absolutely divergent from each other and demanding quite different skills) can by syncretistic or radical.

It is undeniably more beneficial to the married academic woman to plan from the beginning: never to have to compensate for years lost in terms of psychological self-preparation as well as in terms of professional life. It might be of interest to research the possibility that women's production curve may follow a somewhat different trajectory from that of men, one that would peak in, say, her forties rather than her thirties; and, if this is so, to determine to what extent the difference is societally created and maintained. There is so much knowledge still obscured from us, and I admit to feeling my way as likely as not through experience itself. The difficulty of writing anything on marriage-and-academic-careers capable of outlasting its publication year can be demonstrated by the present impact of this apodictic pronouncement: "A woman must still live where her husband's job takes her and live largely in the style that his work imposes" (Decter, 1972).

There is no doubt in my mind that, as in the case of the academic man, a loving home base can prove the most solid support for the career of the academic woman; and no doubt that she will need support that cannot come from "outside." I find one reason for this in that there exists as yet no agglomeration of time-honored precedents for styles of behavior on the part of academic women, especially those of child-bearing age, who constitute a distinct category in my mind. The easygoing conversational relationship that a man can quickly establish with his colleagues can be constrained in the case of a woman by a variety of sexually conditioned nonsense; when this is not present I perceive a considerable (albeit laudable) departure from the styles of Western Civ. We have all watched fledgling assistant professors (male) find with little trouble the tone of obsequious camaraderie with superiors that facilitates their upwardly directed pilgrimage. I feel sure that such a tone employed by a woman can easily connote some kind of sexual overture. From a strictly pragmatic standpoint, I think that in a historical period which finds human beings relying so obviously on styles, it is important for academic women to capture and cultivate a general style and perhaps not remain satisfied by or resigned to a plurality of styles, as reported by an active and searching writer on the topic (Harris, 1972).

I have described a situation that encompasses built-in irregularities: job-changing, travel, a gulf between academic and domestic life. Upon this restless ground women find themselves under justifiable pressure to keep up a regular professional schedule, and I believe that this must be done at almost any cost. It is one of the persuasive means of overcoming a widespread prejudice against the hiring and promotion of married women, existent at a level that legislation can barely penetrate. I have moved my family and myself in order to meet deadlines or be somewhere on time and never regretted the momentary wrench in the long run. I am familiar with the other side of this kind of story: it should be noted, and never underestimated, that in today's academe, even its kindlier precincts, upcoming males can obtain preference over females even to the extent of having their own domestic conflicts taken specially into account when salary and promotion schedules are being determined. In a language department of a major university, for example, a male associate professor was undergoing the throes of a long and unfriendly divorce. For this express reason alone, his department chairman proposed that he be promoted to full professor ahead of schedule and his salary raised accordingly, even

though he had long been neglecting his teaching and research duties and did not merit the promotion academically. Imagine, if you will, anything similar occurring in the case of a woman. I hazard that she would be called on the carpet for dereliction of duty and be addressed pointedly on the difficulties of combining marriage and career. There might be a tacit sense of the inevitability of her departure from the university or of "freezing" her in her current status.

Under these circumstances a great deal of our thinking and living has to be done "as if." The data that describe precedents are not overly encouraging. Sociological studies tend to concentrate on the question of Saving the American Marriage. Arnott (1972a) reports, for instance, that marriage is not endangered by the increasing emphasis on careers for wives, that greater liberality of attitude on the part of wives leads to a sense of greater freedom and independence "only up to a point," because placing the husband "in an extremely incongruent position" was not characteristic of "liberal" women. She found that the strain of transition was matched by greater tolerance for tension, which frequently "enriched" the marital relationship. These findings indirectly illustrate how partial the compromises of the emancipated couple seem when compared to the potential of a real equality between professional husband and professional wife. The latter is the conclusion of Bem (1970). Were it otherwise, Arnott would have had to record intense strain and dramatic conflict between husband and wife, and perhaps attempt some correlation between the couple's attitudes and the progress of the wife's career itself.

It is significant that I can find scarcely an item among the studies that accords primacy to the career and not the marriage of the wife, more than a commonplace in studies of achievement goals among men. I see virtually no attempts to correlate husbands' participation in domestic maintenance with the current professional status of their wives.

What I have encountered frequently amounts to a vexing and worrying and juggling of the "relationship" of wife and husband that grotesquely resembles the presumed expectations of women in affective relationships as set forth by Gumpertz (1967) and related by Hoffman (1972) to childhood conditioning. We are here perilously close to the old position set forth by E. Rostow (1964): that a seeming equality in marriage, a new (read "modish") emphasis on relationship and a new premium on smooth accommodation help the modern woman keep marriage and family always first without resenting the fact that her place would continue unequal in the world of work, and therefore suffering no marriage-career conflict. Such conclusions ignore the finding that for a number of married women careers assume priority over marriage and family, as for many business and professional men (Bernard, 1964). Only a few studies indicate that the amount of education a woman has received can function as a more important determinant with respect to her decision to work than marriage or children. Astin (1970) found that of the almost 2,000 women doctorates she surveyed ten years after they had completed their Ph.D.s, 91% were working, 81% full time.

In the face of such an overweening emphasis on marriage it might be profitable to examine not only our motives but the impediments with which they collide in the academic world.

That married women ought to envision moving without their family if necessary is confirmed by the continuation of antinepotism practice in language departments (MLA, 1971). It is obvious that such policies should be contested and abolished; and equally obvious that during the time this might take they must be vitiated by the acts of those most deeply affected.

Married women in academic institutions have to cope with discrimination as regards paid maternity leave. Even when it is provided, such leave can be attended by major complications. My experience is relevant here. In 1968 at UCLA, where I held my first full-time appointment, some three weeks after my daughter was born the chairman of the department attempted to coerce me into compensating out of pocket the teaching assistant who had taken over a course for me during my paid leave. I refused to do so and eventually obtained from the university administration the concession that the department of Italian had acted improperly. The disadvantage of such a beginning to a young professional is hardly negligible.

Finally, I categorize as a difficulty the financial fluctuations in the fortunes of career couples. It has been pointed out that the economic advantages attainable by academic couples with two salaries are offset by the losses incurred when the household and child care tasks normally allotted to the wife must be performed by paid help, and I think that such a contingency arises often enough to give this matter importance. My own experience, however, has been different, even considering additional household expenses. It seems to me that in general the difficult period of investment as in any business, any gamble, can turn after a time to a long and greatly rewarding trend of economic gain. The salaries increase while the child grows, and if the early years can be gotten over with mutual concern and a quotient of grace (as well as determination to shift privilege and find the best possible child care) the inconvenience and worry are amply worth it. It must be kept in mind, nevertheless, that so far, considering the tax deductions permitted businessmen, working couples are unfairly penalized (Harris, 1970).

These are formidable obstacles, indeed, but insufficiently so to be substituted for motives, and I believe that the latter may possess at least an occasionally separate configuration. The academic world is more or less familiar with the conclusions of Matina Horner (1972), now president of Radcliffe College, whose psychological investigations found that U. S. women actively fear success. The few studies of women's motivation antedating Horner's showed a high level of anxiety. Reasonably certain that this meant women were afraid of competition, she decided to test this notion. Placing women and men in competitive and noncompetitive situations, Horner found that males showed a spurt of motivation toward competition while females did not. It was anxiety about competition that apparently held females back. Horner discovered that this fear of success in competition was tied to the attitude of society in general and male friends in particular. Perhaps the best known of her experiments is at once the most heartrending: asked to write about an imagined man at the top of his medical school class, more than 90% of the men equated his success with happiness, prosperity, and the ability to marry the girl of his choice. Faced with describing an imagined woman at the top of her class, more than 65% of the women associated her success with depression, illness, and death.

I have cited this well-known work not in order to point at the risks of professional competition or competitive feelings between married persons (if these occur, so it goes) but to emphasize a probable function of the social conditioning that bound the figurative aspirations of these women: to make them ready for marriage as it was conceived during their early and adolescent lives. That raises the question of whether and how the picture has changed. Is marriage a viable choice for a woman who is committed to her academic career? Not so long ago, Bernard (1964) noted that there was "something about the academic professional which makes it, or at least to date has made it, inimical to marriage among women; that if we compare marriage and children as professional assets and liabilities, we find that marriage and children are about equal as assets for women and liabilities for men." On couples and careers she had nothing to report that enhanced the case for marriage.

Why did I want marriage and a child? As far as I can tell, mostly for the same reasons my husband did. Therefore, my own answer to the question of marriage (not career) is a resounding yes, with some riders: the first is the active participation of Lady Fortune, but another is constructive and created—a friendship that does not yield to emotional fluctuations, sexual strains, silly conventions, or other assaults by a world that has never really been hospitable to continuing true-life love stories and in which woman's second-class status has heretofore been an ineluctable fact.

Yet it is only when we can break with the institutionalized and internalized bias toward placing marriage first that we can truly think of women as full persons, taking account of marriage and career as aspects of life that provide alternative and uninterchangeable rewards. Abraham Maslow (1954) noted that not only do human beings reach a level of satiation with any one type of reward, but that there is an order in which various values become motivating forces. There are three main levels in the hierarchy of needs: (1) physiological and safety needs, (2) love and belonging, and (3) esteem and self-actualization. The last is, for Maslow, the expression of the highest human motivation. Basic agreement with these concepts entails a requirement to measure satisfaction both in terms of gain from fulfilled needs and gains in terms of alternatives offering different kinds and levels of reward. Arnott (1972b) examines marriage and career for women in terms of a fundamental assumption derived from exchange theory—that people choose and remain in situations that maximize their "profit," in this case "role profit"—and finds (not surprisingly) that educated women are asserting their desire to maximize life rewards in roles chosen rather than assigned.

We have reason to believe that "role profit" in its aspect of mask for the old argument that a woman has a choice between marriage and career, will not continue indefinitely to function as motive. Economic exigencies have perhaps helped provide some tortuous but beneficial paths to self-actualization. In any event, here is an instance of living "as if," and I believe it is crucial to the success of a woman's academic career: not to persuade oneself that one has a choice, to reorganize one's personal reality so that it becomes delusionary to persuade oneself that this "choice" exists. Such delusions are a handicap to commitment and can function as real impediments.

Again and again we are still told that purposiveness, analysis, forcefulness, and penetration are characteristic of the male intellect, that is, the intellects of men; that expressive values, "symbolic creativity," and receptivity are the lot of the Ladies. Is it not yet obvious that were this the case there would be no problem, or, as Machiavelli remarked in The Prince, "if humankind were good, my teachings would not be good"? It is never sufficiently underscored that society can, therefore, scarcely afford to shut out one half of our population from full effectiveness in the academic work force. Here emphasis on "finding oneself" and on private rewards should yield to a realization of the aspect of social duty involved. I do not believe, as

does a major spokeswoman (Firestone, 1970), that feminism has "the essential mission of creating cultural acceptance of the new ecological balance necessary for the survival of the human race in the twentieth century," though I have always thought of myself as a feminist born. But I do believe that the full economic self-determination of women can only help. A good marriage is too valuable to be sacrificed by women who want one. However, since each past wave of feminism has receded, having deposited its gains, there is an ever-present danger that—the curbing and curtailment of discriminatory language and other harmful practices in official circles notwithstanding—a mutual and tacit compact between individual and society working to constrain the careers of married women may continue intact and provide further avenues for discrimination to go underground in academe.

References

Arnott, Catherine C. 1972a. "Husbands' Attitudes and Wives' Commitment to Employment." JMF, 34, 673-84.

_____. 1972b. "Married Women and the Pursuit of Profit: An Exchange Theory Perspective." JMF, 34, 122-34.

Astin, Helen. 1970. The Woman Doctorate. New York: Basic Books.

Bernard, Jessie. 1964. Academic Women. University Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.

Bem, S. L., and Bem, D. J. 1970. "Case Study of a Non-Conscious Ideology: Training the Woman to Know Her Place," in D. J. Bem, Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs, pp. 89-99. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks and Cole.

Decter, Midge. 1972. The Liberated Woman and Other Americans. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan.

Firestone, Shulamith. 1970. The Dialectics of Sex. New York: Pantheon.

Harris, Ann Sutherland. 1970. "The Second Sex in Academe," AAUP Bulletin, 56, 283-95.

Hoffman, Lois Wladis. 1972. "Early Childhood Experiences and Women's Achievement Motives," JSI, 28, 129-55.

Horner, Matina S. 1972. "Toward an Understanding of Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women," JSI, 28, 157-75.

Gumpertz, E. 1967. "Women: The Last Minority?" Columbia University Forum, 10, 30-34.

Maslow, Abraham. 1954. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Bros.

MLA. 1971. "The Status of Women in Modern Language Departments: A Report of the MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession," PMLA, 86, 459-68.

Rostow, E. 1964. "Job Discrimination against Faculty Wives," JHE, 37, 21-56.

SHARED APPOINTMENTS

On Sharing an Academic Appointment

Nancy G. Terrebonne and Robert A. Terrebonne

Ours is not a conventional marriage—although it is in some respects a relationship more traditional than many others. Ours is a marriage of minds—a communion of two equal partners. We share completely our work and our responsibilities in the home; what each of us does is both interconnected with and interdependent upon what the other does. Our goal at present is to find a working arrangement outside the home parallel to that inside our home. We are looking for an opportunity to share our responsibilities and duties on the job, as we do at home.

So far responses to our efforts to obtain a shared appointment have been varied but essentially negative. They range from curiosity regarding the novelty of our proposal ("it is unusual, as you will be aware, to receive tandem applications for two halves of one job. I should, nonetheless, be willing to consider your joint application"*) to interest coupled with indecision and ultimately rejection of the idea ("your proposal of a joint appointment was interesting . . . but I needed to take it up with higher administrators. The decision is that we will consider each of you separately for a full-time position") to simple rejection without interest ("it is very unlikely that we could offer you a joint appointment" and "it just doesn't seem feasible") and even to outright resistance and distrust ("I wouldn't even mention it" and "it could be threatening").

In most cases it is impossible for us to determine whether in fact our proposal to share an appointment is taken seriously. We are told, "We considered you both as a team and individually." But we wonder whether we were really considered unprejudicially as a team.

The basic reaction we get to our proposition to share an appointment is that our idea is too different and new; it's "unusual" and out of the ordinary. Typically, department chairmen anticipate opposition from above; they aren't sure what the administration would think or how such an arrangement could be worked into the overall structure of the faculty. They can't themselves hire us and are reluctant to promote our hiring without getting the approval of higher level administrators. And typically, higher level administrators resist trying anything new or different. There is also some question about how the arrangement would be dealt with in terms of the usual procedures for granting tenure and promotion and for arranging things like fringe benefits: insurance policies, health insurance coverage, retirement plans, etc. One fellow who interviewed us defined the basic objection to a shared appointment as an "accounting" problem: "The payroll office wouldn't know how to handle it." Another chairman recently explained that opposition would most surely come from the AAUP, which as collective bargaining agent is opposed to any kind of "special contract," which a shared appointment would necessarily entail.

We believe that prospective employers are also suspicious that we want only one salary—suspicious of a couple who would be content to get one salary to live on when they could get two. They are fearful, too, particularly in a small department, that a husband-and-wife team would have an "undue amount of influence" over the direction of the policies of the department. One man who interviewed us cited an example of a couple he had known whose presence on the faculty was "a very divisive factor." He referred to the polarization in the department" as a result of this couple. "Their influence," he said, "was unbelievable . . . When there were meetings, they acted as a team in such a way that it was impossible to ignore them or separate them."

Most individuals, however, who receive our applications have had no personal experience with couples in a department. They feel some concern—though they seldom voice it to us directly—about what would happen if our marriage broke up. We suspect, too, that most married people cannot envision themselves sharing a job with their mates, and this accounts for their automatic rejection of the idea as a real possibility.

Basically, all employers that we have approached with the idea of a shared appointment view it with distrust. It would cause "problems" in the sense that the school would have to deal with something new. The arrangement doesn't fit into their traditional policies and practices for paying people and insuring people and retiring people and promoting people. It's a bother.

*All quotations are from letters we have received or conversations we have engaged in with prospective employers.

Our main contention is that these problems are all minor compared to the advantages that we as a team would bring to a job. The primary advantage is obvious; essentially, the school is getting two for the price of one. We offer a combined range of educational backgrounds and teaching experiences that a single person is not likely to have. We offer a broad range of experience within a definite specialization--sociolinguistics and the teaching of composition. We have individual interests within this field: one of us is more theoretical, for example, the other more practical; one of us has a greater interest in the history of the language, the other has a more specialized interest in certain "problem" areas, such as the teaching of composition to individuals with learning disabilities. We are also quite distinct individuals with respect to our teaching. We are, in short, different personalities, different human beings.

Additional advantages that a shared appointment would provide also naturally result from the fact that we are two separate individuals. Absenteeism should be less since when one member of the family is sick or out of town, the other could logically take that one's place. Furthermore, since neither partner's teaching load would be heavy, there would be more free time for one or both to do research. As we see it, rejecting our proposal to share one job is thus denying benefits to all parties concerned.

This rejection also seems to be forcing us to go our separate ways. We've been down that road before. So far it has amounted to our working separately but unequally. We have experienced, for example, a situation where one of us earned more than three times as much as the other earned for doing very little more work (no more than 10 extra students per academic year). We have encountered situations where even this possibility was denied us. One would-be employer informed us before we were married that if we were to marry while both working in his department, he would be forced to fire one of us. We have also been actively engaged in the past several years in fighting against antinepotism rules which prohibit the full-time employment of both spouses in the same department at the same time. Yet we feel that this new prohibition against sharing an appointment is just as prejudicial and just as discriminatory as the more conventional antinepotism policies or that often it reflects the fact that traditional antinepotism policies still exist. One prospective employer, in fact, wrote us recently, "You will be considered separately for this position, as ——— College has a policy where members of the same family (immediate) cannot be hired on a full-time basis."

That it is prejudice we are dealing with is implicit in the fact that few if any of the prospective employers we have written or talked to have actually had any previous experience with a couple who shared an appointment. The argument that we might have a disruptive influence, that acting as a team our power within a department could be very great—very "divisive"—is likewise a prejudiced opinion. First of all, this argument was advanced on the strength of experience with only two couples. Second, it is actually an argument against traditional nepotism situations where both husband and wife hold separate appointments. The same situation could not exist if we as a couple shared a single appointment, including sharing a single vote in all departmental decisions.

As for "problems" that would arise as a result of both of us working in the same department, we are reminded of a conversation (confrontation?) one of us had with a department chairman over this same subject:

> Chairman: I myself would be reluctant to hire a married couple. I'm not saying I wouldn't do it, but I do think that you--uh--that you pose certain problems for yourself when you do it. Would you agree on that?
> NT: Like what?
> (Long pause)
> Chairman: Like teaching schedules, like promotion and tenure, like a great many things. I think one would pose problems for--
> NT: Well, it seems to me that that encourages a lot of other things. For instance, it seems to me that I would be better off in terms of getting employment if I went out and got a divorce. And it also seems to me discrimination against me because I happen to be interested in the same thing my husband's interested in.

In response to the usually unstated but sometimes explicit question, "who gets the job in the event of a divorce," our answer is that first of all, in that unlikely event, it might be that we would prefer to continue sharing the appointment (not all divorces are disagreeable; that's just another prejudice so many of us believe in). Second, if we decided to go our separate ways, then logically the "person" holding the shared appointment would no longer exist. What would result would be a job opening for which either one or both of us might apply. The problem, then, of "who gets the job" would be our problem--not the university's.

And in response to the often unstated question of why we would want one job instead of two, our answer relates both to our own needs and to the present job market. We both want to work, that is, to have a paid position outside the home. The traditional idea that one of us should go to work and the other stay home is obviously a waste of brainpower. We have experienced this situation. It is frustrating and unsatisfying to us both. And, given the present job market, it is unlikely that we will both find openings in two places in the same area. One prospective employer stated it very bluntly: "Although we have a number of colleges and universities . . . we also have a number of graduate schools pouring out English teachers, and we have a fair number of schools closing completely and many more cutting back drastically on faculty positions and laying off current faculty members. Thus we probably have more unemployed English teachers than any other section of the country." We agree that the best thing for the economy of our country is to have as many people working as possible. We are not out, therefore, to make as much money as we can; we believe that we can live comfortably on one salary, and it's a good thing for us to want just one job instead of two; it makes more work for somebody else.

We do not deny, therefore, that establishing a shared appointment would cause an institution some administrative and accounting problems (the proposition is not, however, the rarity that some employers assume; there are a number of couples sharing jobs of various kinds--including college teaching positions—in this country). But there is no way that these problems can compare with the benefits that would accrue for everyone involved--both for ourselves and our prospective employers and for our society at large.

Good Work If You Can Get It: The Experiences of One Academic Couple

David Schuman

When we were married in 1968, two graduate students in English, the academic job crunch was not yet critical. We knew that we might have to settle for two jobs at different colleges, with perhaps a commute for one or both of us, and we were pretty sure we wouldn't be able to stay in the San Francisco Bay area. We were, in other words, tragically naive. Since then we've been extraordinarily lucky; we were unemployed for only three months and are now in one good position, about to start another. But had we known on our wedding day the insecurity and disorientation that we have in fact experienced in the last few years, I am sure that at least one of us would have switched to a more lucrative and secure occupation. Double academic careers can be doubly rewarding, but they can also lead to double despair.

Our disillusionment was not immediate. Even before I had my M.A., I had a job as instructor in a small Bay Area Jesuit university. I worked hard and did well, got what were considered plum courses for my rank, and made a salary that far exceeded our needs, which were still conditioned by the forced poverty of studenthood. A year later my wife got her degree and, surpassing even our own naive expectations, found a job at a nearby small Catholic college. It was fifty miles away, and only part-time, but who cared? We made what seemed like a fortune, and loved our work and our lives. We went to Europe two summers in a row, arousing the envy of our nonacademic friends who didn't have the time and our noncouple academic friends who didn't have the money. We were popular with colleagues and students. We taught Hopkins and Chaucer, Lennon and Dylan, Hobbes and Hunter Thompson. We had parties and barbecues and played softball, and lived out the rich fantasies I'm sure our students had constructed around our lives: as young and enthusiastic teachers we actually sat around after dinner discussing poems and books, teaching ploys, the inequities of the grading system, nonauthoritarian alternatives to the classroom situation. Other couples envied us because we shared interests and friends; when one of us talked about new work in our field, or John Donne, or the chairman's drinking habits, or someone's chances for tenure, the other didn't suffer the kind of chronic yawns that most faculty spouses seemed to spend half of their lives trying to stifle.

After a couple of years of this pleasantness, I began to enter the terminal stages of my nonpromotable instructorship. We decided that the Ph.D. was the next logical step for both of us, leading quite easily to better jobs, more money, and a continually satisfying life. So in the fall of 1971, we packed our furniture, baseball gloves, hibachi, and two tons of books into a fourteen-foot U-Haul and drove off 2,000 miles to a prestigious Ph.D. program.

Now, some three and a half years later, with one Ph.D. in hand and the other near enough to touch, we're making less money, teaching duller (and more) courses to more (and duller) students at a less selective university in an alien section of the country—and quite uncynically counting our blessings, not only because our future looks good but also because our present is so much better than it could have been.

In 1972, we could see that by the next September we'd be ready to go back to work, well into our dissertations, so we began to job hunt. We each sent out nearly 300 letters of inquiry (not, we know, MLA-endorsed procedures, but in our judgment the best bet). Each of us, in a P. S., mentioned that the other was applying for a similar position within another specialty (I'm Victorian, my wife is Renaissance) and urged the chairman not to let either of our applications prejudice the other, indicating a willingness to work together or apart. These letters produced, by MLA Convention time, one positive response for each of us, strangely enough from the same school, which eventually, after we decided to take a $500 trip to New York for the interviews, didn't hire either of us. Total rejection. We suffered our first encounter with simultaneous personal and professional despair. Here we were, two bright and industrious Ph.D. candidates at a great university, with undergraduate degrees from another, with lots of college teaching experience, good prestigious references, youth, health, enthusiasm, devotion, etc.—and here were all of the colleges in the United States telling us, some in the most insulting and degrading terms, that they had no positions, or that the positions they had were being filled by other (read: "better") candidates. One snotty chairman turned us down and then added that he hoped we could take solace from the fact that our letters of application were lodged next to each other, alphabetically, in his "inactive" file. We knew that the market was grim, but we thought that would affect "others": the less experienced, the less qualified, graduates from less elite programs. We couldn't figure out why neither of us was getting offers—or even nibbles. After an awful lot of brooding self-examination, we finally concluded that the social Darwinism of the profession was rendering its verdict on us: we were unfit, in spite of our best efforts to tailor ourselves for survival.

All of this had obvious negative effects on our relationship. Between early November, when the rejections started rolling in, and January, we became intimate with the habits of our mailman. His footstep half a block away had the same effect on us that the whine of our can opener had on our omnivorous nineteen-pound tomcat: palpitation, nervous pacing, all the symptoms of a subtle adrenaline rush. Except, unlike our cat, we always came up empty. Our days took on a grim pattern: hopeful mornings, bolstered by caffeine optimism, building to the afternoon mail call, which invariably produced a severe crash into depression and despair, tears and arguments, anger and free-floating resentment.

Finally, we got a reprieve. A tiny, highly selective college in California had a one-year nonrenewable position, and they were interested in one of us. The chairman cautioned us, though, that the college was quite isolated and that the one of us who wasn't teaching would be idle and bored. We wrote back suggesting that we split the one position between us, dividing the duties as we saw fit. Our bargaining strength lay in our lukewarmth toward a one-year appointment. We probably should have snatched the original offer and haggled later. But our suggestion was accepted, we were hired sight unseen, and a couple of months later we were back in another U-Haul, heading West.

If our first period of simultaneous employment could be called our infatuation with the profession, our second was a period of mature bliss, but whether this was due to the fact that we shared a job or to the idiosyncrasies of the particular job we shared is hard to say. It was at Deep Springs College, a small school and working cattle ranch established by a grant in 1917 in the high desert of eastern California. The twenty or twenty-five students who comprise the entire student body are carefully selected according to the highest academic and personal standards: the application is nine essays, often running over twenty-five pages; the average verbal S.A.T. score is over 700. All students are granted a full room, board, and tuition scholarship. In addition to their academic schedule, they operate the entire ranch, everything from riding herd and milking cows to keeping books and washing dishes; further, they have large responsibilities of self-regulation. Needless to say, our situation was unique.

Our classes were small, usually consisting of under five students, all of whom were bright, highly motivated, and interesting. The community was close and, by necessity, congenial, rigorous, practical, and fun—made to order for crypto-Calvinists like me and my wife. We taught four courses, two as a team and one each on our own, with a lot of flexibility within this arrangement. I'd guest-lecture in my wife's class, and vice versa, or one of us would take over the team-taught course when it wandered into his or her area of expertise. Classes often extended long past their allotted times, into meals (which the entire community took together in a dining hall), after dinner, late into the night. It was not unusual for us to sit in the dining hall until midnight discussing Shakespeare with some students until we couldn't stay awake, and then come into breakfast the next morning at dawn only to find ourselves at a table with the same students, carrying on the same conversation as though it had never stopped. Equally often, the subject of these conversations would be nonliterary or nonacademic, with the students teaching us about irrigation, or hog-raising, or astronomy. The distinction between our "personal" and "intellectual" concerns, between "job" and "life," disappeared. Because we were both involved

in the business of the community, this total immersion was a joy to us both. Otherwise, one spouse's immersion would have led to the other's resentment and alienation; we saw that happen to other couples. The fact that both of us taught—neither was "baggage," like other spouses—allowed our natural relationship with students to extend into our home and our natural relationship with our neighbors and co-diners to extend into the classroom. It was a perfect situation for a working couple.

It was also a one-year nonrenewable situation, so even before we arrived we had started a new job hunt. Again, 600 letters. Again, a dismal response. At MLA time we each had one interview: one at a school in North Carolina, the other for an instructorship at a university in New Orleans. Our standards, always low, had disappeared, and we were willing to take any kind of teaching position, anywhere. By February both of the interviews had produced rejections, and the routine of despair began anew. As February became March and April and May and neither of us had a job after June, the despair intensified, and we reached depths that have, I am sure, left permanent scars. In June, when nothing turned up, we decided to stall until September with a stop-gap nonacademic job, waiting for a last-minute teaching position, and if nothing opened, then to get out of the business for good. The pressure, the tensions, the destructiveness, and the indignity of the job hunt were just not worth it. We became, on June 15, full-time professional cooks on a ranch in Nevada. In our spare time I looked for a "real" job for the fall, in "business," and my wife worked on her dissertation (mine had been done since March; my first unemployment came upon me almost at the same time as my doctorate). We had long since relinquished our cheer and our self-confidence; at this point we were both lucky to keep a tenuous grip on our sanity and our marriage. We deeply regretted having committed both of ourselves to the same devastated career.

Finally, in early August, we got another reprieve. The chairman of the English department at a giant Midwestern state university phoned my wife with a job offer: another one-year, nonrenewable instructorship. She accepted immediately, and that night we had a celebration as though we'd won a Nobel Prize. The next weekend we flew to the campus to house hunt and, not incidentally, to try to talk the chairman into letting us share the position.

He had no idea of my existence. In about July, we'd stopped applying to the same jobs, fearing that chairmen might be shying away from our couple-ness. This fear turned out to be justified. The chairman at my wife's new job told us that applications from couples "cancelled each other out," particularly now, with pressure to hire women, because hiring a wife would leave the husband unemployed. Further, he told us, regulations at his university prevented him from hiring both of us. Although we had strong feelings about both his cancellation policy and the university's antinepotism rules—we doubted the logic of the former and the legality of the latter—we silently regarded the prospect of life as fry cooks, and glumly accepted his decision. We found a home, paid a deposit, and, with me facing a year of underemployment in a football-crazy dust-bowl college town, we headed back West to pack.

When we got there, though, there was a telephone message for my wife from the New Orleans chairman she'd interviewed at MLA. As it happened, he had a last-minute job to offer, and since it was renewable four times and in an exotic city, my wife was prone to accept it. Quite hesitantly, she asked if she could share the job with her husband; the chairman said she could, he'd done that before, and he assured her that within a year, if we worked out, we'd each have our own full-time position due to the natural turnover of a department with fifty instructors. Load: four courses per semester, three composition and a sophomore literature survey. Pay: decorum prevents me from quoting a figure, but suffice it to say that one instructor's salary fell well within the United States government's definition of "working poor." We accepted the offer, begged off the job in the Midwest (they had not yet sent a contract), quit our jobs as cooks, and drove off in a U-Haul heading south.

The transition from Deep Springs to this new job was radical and traumatic: from a tiny, selective, desert residential school to a huge (12,000), open admissions (in a state ranked 49th nationally in literacy), tropical commuter college. For one semester, we split a job, each teaching two courses; officially and in fact we were each a half-time employee, with neither the rights nor the duties of a full-timer: no committee assignments, no votes in department meetings, no coverage under the college's medical plan. We discovered, however, an undeniable law of partial employment: The Work Expands to Fill the Time. We found ourselves each putting in full-time for our half-time jobs. As a result, our students were getting very fine classes, our department was getting an incredible bargain, and we were getting underpaid. Somehow, this hadn't mattered at Deep Springs; there, the pay seemed like a gift. But in this situation, we began to feel exploited. So we were quite happy when the very next semester we each became full-time. Our salary doubled, our work time stayed about the same, and, although our teaching suffered slightly, we found the arrangement much fairer.

With two full-time jobs, at a normal university, there is no intermingling of duties, no trade-offs; we are like any other two instructors, except that we happen to be married to each other, and because we have two salaries within our family, we can live more comfortably than our noncouple colleagues. But we have found that the course load, which amounts to over a hundred students each (and consequently over a hundred papers weekly), not only prevents us from enjoying our double pay, but also precludes reaping any of the other benefits of shared employment. What "spare" time we have is spent writing and haggling over chores. Gone are most of the long dinner-table discussions, replaced by harried hamburgers with an argument over who can most afford the time off to do the dishes and next week's shopping. Gone, too, the special relationship with students that our couple-ness (and childlessness) allowed for at smaller, more personal schools. My students don't know my wife teaches, and, if they did, they wouldn't care any more than they'd care if they discovered that two checkers at their supermarket were husband and wife. To most of our students, we are state employees, dispensing a service to which they are, by virtue of their parents' taxes, entitled. We are not part of their community.

So, when Deep Springs recently offered to make our former job permanent—the man we had visited for, having returned from his sabbatical, decided to go elsewhere—we jumped at the offer, in spite of a substantial cut in total salary. Our experiences as a teaching couple compel this decision. We have shared a job, split a job, and had two jobs; we've worked at huge, medium, and small colleges; private, public, and Catholic; selective and open; South and West. In every situation we have found that being a teaching couple greatly decreases the probability of being hired and intensifies the despair of unemployment; we therefore advise overlapping applications only at colleges with a known policy of hiring couples. On the other hand, we have found that once hired, being a couple greatly increases the rewards of our profession. It's great work if you can get it. It seems greatest to us when the jobs total less than two full-time equivalents and are located in a college with good students and a distinct sense of community. Consequently, when we pack up and head West this fall, we hope it will be in our last U-Haul for at least a few years.

Will the Real Professor Please Stand Up?

Catherine Christie Nicholl

Can a middle-aged couple find fulfillment in a shared appointment when one has earned tenure, rank, and seniority while the other has spent most of the previous ten years at home with the children? In 1973 my husband and I decided to seek the answer to this question. Since facing the dismal job market in 1971, armed with a new Ph.D. and seven years of college teaching back in the fifties, I had held three different part-time teaching jobs, all temporary, and knew myself to be lucky at that. The last of these jobs, as a sabbatical replacement, involved virtually full-time teaching at a part-time salary. The teaching was interesting—five different courses during the year—but I was exhausted. Even on weekends there was little time for the family. The two incomes were nice but we had no time to enjoy them. After years of immersion in the profession, my husband was eager to try some new directions and also to take more responsibility for the children. Furthermore, there were no good job openings in view for me for the following year and the prospect of an annual job search was discouraging.

With various motives, then—a more relaxed life-style, better family life, and greater job security for me—we decided to ask Augsburg College to change my husband's appointment in the English department to one shared equally with me. I was not unknown to the college, having taught there for three years in the fifties. We offered them the motivation of getting the strongest areas of two good teachers (fortunately I had a specialization not represented in the department) and of offering to students "an example of a relatively new way to combine professional and family responsibilities and of an institution's willingness to cooperate in such a venture." (I quote from our letter of application.) We further pointed out that it would be a venture without risk or added expense to the college. Which of these arguments clinched it I don't know, but the department chairperson was enthusiastic and the dean was persuaded.

The problems of writing a truly joint contract are complex. The main difficulty arises with benefits, because here the college is dealing with several outside agencies. We immediately discovered that although Augsburg offers many benefits on a proportional basis to part-time faculty, the disability insurance is available, according to the contract with the insurance company, only to full-time faculty. Therefore, in order that one of us could be insured, we decided to accept our total remuneration under one contract, currently my husband's. (I have a contract of my own stating this salary arrangement.) This means that I am collecting neither

Social Security nor retirement of my own, but because I had no funds previously in retirement and comparatively little in Social Security, we think we stand to collect more this way than if we alternated contracts. We plan to investigate these matters more thoroughly, and of course there is nothing irrevocable about our current contract arrangement.

Some feminist colleagues have expressed horror at the fact that my name is not on the paycheck, but I am not troubled by this: we both know that I've earned half of it. It is certainly true that our financial destinies are linked, but this, after all, is characteristic of marriage. We do hope to avoid what the AAUP's Committee W called "an artificial linking of two separate professional identities and careers." The faculty is currently considering instituting tenure for people who teach at least half-time. Should this proposal go through, I will soon be eligible for tenure, and my husband's tenure would be modified to part-time tenure. When I come up for promotion or tenure, it will be on my own merits and not as half of a team. Since we began sharing the position, my husband--on his own merits--has been promoted to full professor (or "real professor" as one of our daughters called it).

The reactions to our change in job-style were interesting. Most people assumed that the job scarcity was the only reason for our decision and admired my husband for his willingness to give up part of his position (status as well as job). The assumption was that I was the sole beneficiary, an idea that amuses my husband and, I must admit, irritates me. My first day on campus a well-meaning administrator asked whether I was taking a course, since that is a role faculty wives frequently play here. A few colleagues seemed to assume that I was sharing a position in order to be first in line for any full-time opening, an idea that was dispelled in a few months when two full-time jobs opened up in our department and I didn't apply. Students have been interested in our arrangement from the start, particularly as a means to involvement with one's children as well as one's profession. And our children have learned to respond to telephone calls for "Dr." or "Professor" Nicholl with "Which one?"

The clearest advantage of our arrangement has been to our family life. We both have more free time on weekends and more energy at the end of the day. When our daughters, Nancy, 11, and Carolyn, 7, come home from school, one of us--and not always the same one--is there. Which of us stays home with a sick child depends on our respective class schedules that day. After ten years of relatively polarized roles, we are returning to the shared housekeeping of our early married life; we choose tasks by preference and divide up the ones neither of us likes (like cleaning). Consequently our children are getting used to less rigid sex roles in the family and are also seeing that change is possible even for middle-aged people. We realize now how good an arrangement like our present one would have been for all of us when our children were babies and preschoolers.

Personally we have benefited from the shared position in different ways. My husband has had time to pioneer extension courses involving senior citizens and younger students together, outside of his regular teaching load. He has also had time to become actively involved in our daughters' elementary school and to pursue his interest in jazz piano. For me, after my ten-year sabbatical, teaching is more exciting than anything else, and I find that work expands to fill the available time. The overtime is partly due to the fact that since my return to teaching I have only once repeated a course. Or it may be that I'm not suited to a more relaxed life-style.

The main disadvantage of our shared position is, of course, financial, small college salaries being what they are. There is not money for both of us to do all the things that two professional people would like to do, including buying books, attending conferences, keeping up with films and plays, and paying the necessary babysitters. Teaching summer school or an occasional extra course during the year has helped out here and has also helped satisfy my appetite for teaching in terms when my assignment consisted of only one course. Nevertheless, our basic assignment remains one full-time course load, equally shared, and we expect to keep it that way.

One problem that has not arisen, except when the class schedule inadvertently omits our initials, is the problem of merged identities. We share an office but our schedules are by intention different; thus we barely see each other coming and going and almost never have lunch together. We don't worry about separate identities because we have different curricular and extracurricular interests, different styles of teaching, and different views on many college and departmental matters. We are sometimes asked in subtle or direct ways to make commitments for each other, but this we learned to avoid long ago in dealing with salespeople, solicitors, and our children.

For us, the shared appointment has worked well. We are both doing what we want to do, which includes an active parental role, and we have the added satisfaction of knowing that we aren't holding down more jobs than we need when many able members of our profession are out of work.

Some Thoughts on Job-S[illegible]

Nancy and Peter Rabinowitz

> "It'll never be known how this has to be told, in the first person or in the second, using the third person plural or continually inventing modes that will serve for nothing."
> Julio Cortázar, "Blow-Up"
> (trans. Paul Blackburn)

Inspector Bones, in Tom Stoppard's play Jumpers, has a brother who was an osteopath. "Bones the Bones, they called him. Every patient had to make that little joke. It drove him mad, finally."

We know that feeling well. It was especially acute on the last day of our first year at Kirkland College, when we lounged about uncomfortably in our academic garb, waiting for graduation to begin. At least six people quipped, "How come you get two robes? Why don't you share one?" Thus the year closed, appropriately enough, as it had opened: with feeble jokes about the nature of our position. The two of us are, as the usual phrasing has it, "an" assistant professor of literature. Two people, one position. Two robes, one paycheck.

We haven't always been a curiosity; we were once a reasonably normal couple. In June 1974, we were leading what could well be called the "good life" in Chicago. Peter was a tenured and well-paid assistant professor of humanities at Southwest College, one of Chicago's community colleges. Nancy, having previously worked both full- and part-time as the Assistant Humanities Editor at the University of Chicago Press, was then free-lancing and writing her dissertation on dragon battles in Aeschylus' Oresteia. We had the kind of close friends you have only in a community where you have lived for some time, a six-room apartment it had taken six years to find, and subscriptions to the Chicago Symphony. Why did we give it all up for strangers, the cramped quarters of faculty residents in a dormitory, and the Syracuse Symphony (50 miles away, at that)? Why did we move to tiny Clinton, New York, with a substantial loss of security and salary—for half a job each?

Perhaps we were unconsciously spurred by the adventure of it all. Not that we were excited by the adventure per se--but we probably wanted to prove to ourselves that we were not immune to it and that our feelings of comfort and security had not chained us to an academically mediocre position. But there were conscious and rational reasons as well, both professional and personal.

The most important stimulus—the one that prodded us into job-searching in the first place—was our idea of what our marriage ought to be like. We're not active members of the women's movement, but we're loyal sideliners, and we've worked hard to build a marriage that meets the needs of both of us equally. Part of this has meant trying to share all the responsibilities of the marriage (a goal made easier by our not having any children).

Of course, there were, and still are, some remnants of sexism in our division of labor. Nancy still shies away from doing any of the mechanical chores (fixing the coffee grinder), although Peter does not have particular training or aptitude in those areas; Nancy is still the one who remembers where the garlic press and the shoelaces are kept. But on the whole, we were successful. At least, as successful as we could be, given a fundamental imbalance: we both considered ourselves "teachers," and only one of us actually had a teaching job. And no matter how strong your principles, such professional inequality inevitably undermines a marriage. Peter's work had inflexible deadlines—a novel to read for tomorrow, a tape to prepare for next week. Nancy's dissertation was, of course, no less important, but it always appeared more accommodating. Probably the best way to finish a thesis is to treat it as a "regular job," but the library is not quite an office, and long-term deadlines seem to exert little influence on day-to-day existence.

So, household tasks would easily devolve on Nancy, who had more apparent free time. Southwest College operates both day and night, and when Peter trudged home at 11:00 p.m., it was hard for Nancy to resist the temptation to prepare a quiche or a banana bread. Delectable for both of us, it cut into Nancy's prime evening hours. Then, too, Nancy's routine (library, apartment, an occasional stint at the Press office) was more circumscribed. She saw fewer people on a daily basis, had fewer adventures. Thus, it was not easy to maintain our marital balance. Pressures toward the standard, male-dominated pattern constantly threatened to topple our equality, which was in many ways illusory.

It soon became obvious, then, that finding a job for Nancy had to be our first priority. The Chicago market was fairly bleak. So in December 1973, we began to write some tentative letters to schools out of town. There were few positions to aim at, given Nancy's specializations (primarily Greek, secondarily British fiction) and the general state of the job market. Since we were unwilling to live apart (an increasingly common phenomenon in academic couples), we focused our attention on areas where we might find two jobs: schools in or near cities, schools near other schools, schools with two openings. Of course, we had, in our more rational moments, agreed that if we could find only one job, it was Nancy's turn to be the breadwinner, Peter's to be the bread-maker. But we knew this would still leave us with the reverse of many of the difficulties we were trying to escape. It would be equitable for a time, but far from ideal.

In fact, Peter learned something during a two-week period when it appeared that Nancy might actually be the one employed. Despite his ideals, he faced the prospect of being a "faculty husband" with panic, especially since he too had applied for that same job and had been rejected. What would he say when people asked him who he was, what he did? ("My wife teaches . . ."?) He even started to write a novel so that when the question arose, he would have a socially acceptable response. When that job fell through, part of him felt sorry for Nancy; but his less enlightened self rejoiced. This experience, however, made it clearer to him that a job for Nancy was imperative. If he was unwilling to assume the role of faculty spouse, he could hardly in good conscience expect Nancy to continue doing so.

It was on those occasions where we found ourselves both applying for the same job that we first broached the idea of suggesting a joint appointment. At first we did this hesitantly, usually in a P.S. to the letter that each of us sent out. The more we thought about such a possibility, though, the more appealing it seemed. It would give both of us jobs, without commuting, and it would (theoretically) provide us with a great deal of time for ourselves. Most people assume that we split a job as a compromise when we couldn't find two positions, and that we would grab a second position as soon as it came along. Actually, once we thought of job-sharing, we preferred the idea of part-time work for each of us to the more lucrative alternative of two full-time positions. It would allow Nancy time to finish her dissertation; it would allow both of us to do research (although we were not sure just what that might mean); it would allow Peter to learn the cello and Nancy to pursue her agricultural and horticultural interests; it would allow us to read "unrequired books," to listen to records, to make Peking duck, and to loaf—all of which were included in our definition of the good life.

Nor were we unaware that offering to share an appointment might be a good selling point at schools willing to try something new. As a couple, we could provide a broader background than most individuals could offer: Nancy's Greek and English, Peter's Russian, French, and American (plus music in a pinch). This, we felt, should be especially attractive to a small liberal arts college which could not afford to hire full-time staff in all these fields.

Quite by accident, we stumbled on Kirkland, an entirely new name to us. They wanted someone in classics, preferably with a second field in Russian, French, or women's studies. Combined, the two of us met all those needs, and Kirkland was eager to try out a new kind of appointment. In return, they offered us just the kind of school we were seeking: Kirkland is a new women's college, coordinate with Hamilton College, with a progressive educational policy, a program in literature (rather than English), a young, intellectually solid faculty, and a stunning setting in the countryside of upstate New York. We were apprehensive about living so far from the city: although we had spent summers in central Maine, we still thought of ourselves as big-city kids. But when we were offered the job, we took a deep breath, packed our books and records, and lurched off into the sunrise.

Neither we nor Kirkland had had any experience in making such an arrangement. Our contract is a makeshift affair, despite the months spent getting it in order. Knowing what we know now, we would like to make some changes; in general, though, it is reasonable and equitable. Although we have two votes in faculty and divisional meetings, two offices, and two robes for graduation, we are in most other respects a single faculty member. We split the salary, travel money, insurance, and advisory load of a single person. We also, of course, split the teaching: we each cover three courses a year, although when an extra section of Expository Prose was needed in the spring, Peter (who was only teaching one course that semester) was hired to take that on. (This is yet another way in which we can provide flexibility that a single person could not.) And although we get two copies of most official memos, we share a faculty mailbox, which means that either of us is liable to carry around for days mail destined for the other.

We have received some publicity, especially in the Chicago and upstate New York press; and even before classes began, we found ourselves asked, "How has it worked out?" Even now, we can't give a simple answer. We are reluctant to evaluate the experience after a single year, partly because we are constantly being surprised by ourselves and by Kirkland, partly because

there are so many aspects to that experience. It is difficult to distinguish the effects of job-sharing from the effects of moving from Chicago to Clinton, of living in a dorm, and of switching from an academically rigid open-admissions community college to a more or less experimental, considerably more exclusive four-year institution. We know, though, that we would make the same decision again. On the whole, then, we would judge the year a good one, and the joint appointment a success.

The advantages of our new position are manifold, although many of them have attendant drawbacks. Most important, we are both working equally, which gives us a sense of well-being. We would be the last to deny the pleasures of pure intellectual pursuit; but, perhaps because we are the victims of the work ethic, it's nice to have a job as well.

Working has social as well as professional implications. Neither of us is merely an extension of the other, and this has saved us from much of the strain that would have been placed on the marriage had one or the other of us been the only one teaching. For, despite our fears to the contrary, we have managed to integrate ourselves as a couple into the social fabric more successfully than have most other couples. Nancy is no more "Peter's wife" than Peter is "Nancy's husband," and we are not viewed as part-timers: we have both been accepted as full members of the academic community. This kind of acceptance is especially important in a place like Clinton, for although Kirkland is a women's college, the majority of the faculty is still male, and many faculty spouses (primarily wives) find themselves oppressed in one way or another, adjuncts to a college in a small community where that institution forms a primary center of socialization. At parties, for example, there are often well-intentioned attempts to turn the conversation to "something other than Kirkland." Yet they rarely succeed; college politics remains a major topic of conversation, and those who are not members of the faculty often fall by the wayside.

It would, however, be an exaggeration to say that we have been treated really equally. We notice that Peter tends to be nominated for positions on the more prestigious faculty committees. He, for example, is on the Budget Advisory Committee which fiddles with a budget of millions; Nancy is on the Student Life Committee, which debates a fifty-dollar room damage deposit. Peter is on the Steering Committee of the Assembly; Nancy is an observer to Hamilton faculty meetings. But this appears to reflect the subtle sexism of the faculty and the times, and, as far as we can see, does not stem from the joint appointment as such. Indeed, the entire Budget Advisory Committee, except for the Dean of Academic Affairs, is male.

We also enjoy considerably more free time than do most of our colleagues, although we still have less than we had hoped, for two reasons. First of all, the faculty at Kirkland works exceptionally hard; half a load there is considerably more than half a load at many other places. There are numerous reasons why this is so. For one thing, the college relies to a great extent on close contact with students. For example, in Expository Prose, we are blessed with a maximum class size of twelve. But the course incorporates individualized tutoring: in addition to the normal three hours of class, we meet with each student singly for a half-hour conference every week. This is perhaps the only effective way to teach English composition (at least, it's the best way we know), but it does exhaust us. Other courses, too, call for similar intensity and individual attention. Furthermore, the college is both new (thus lacking a strong "tradition" to help solve problems) and dependent on a democratic student-and-faculty-run government; the consequently heavy committee load seriously drains faculty energies. There is little weeknight frivolity.

Second, as one would expect, various forces (Parkinson's Law, pressures from students and administrators, our own superegos) nibble away at our available time. Splitting a professorship is not quite like splitting a regular nine-to-five job. As all teachers know, class preparation, papers, and conferences can easily absorb all your time and energies; apparently, it matters little whether you are teaching one course or three. (And to think that Peter naively worried that, coming from a school where he taught twelve hours a week, he might be bored with too much free time!) It's hard not to spend that extra hour or two reading students' papers when you actually have the time; it's hard to turn down a student who wants to do independent study in Greek; it's hard to decline an extra committee assignment when your friends are even busier than you are. And since we chose to live as faculty residents in a dorm, we are that much more available to students who want to chat about Dostoevsky, gripe about roommates, or simply quench their thirst.

Thus, while neither of us works the equivalent of full-time, we probably work about fifty percent more than one faculty member would, although we do not earn a commensurate salary. The word "exploitation" leaps to mind, but it is a curious form of exploitation, and avoiding it in a manner that is both advantageous and ethical is not easy. On the one hand, despite its adverse effects on our household economy, this exploitation (which is self-created and generally voluntary) gives us some leverage on the job market. To the extent that we work overtime, we

become cheaper and, therefore, a more desirable commodity. We can offer more for the price than can a single person, a couple that includes only one academic, or an academic couple that, for one reason or another, cannot share a job. In a tight market, then, we are underselling the competition. This clearly makes it easier to get another job (should we ever desire to do so) and to keep the one we have.

It is therefore advantageous to allow ourselves to be used. It is also unethical, and our strong union upbringing makes us acutely conscious that the way in which we work influences not only ourselves but our colleagues as well. Thus, there is some question as to whether we have the right to work as hard as we do. Of course, if we resisted doing more than half a job each, we would gain in other ways, especially with respect to free time. But here, too, there are moral dilemmas: is it in the best spirit of community to refuse an extra committee assignment when you have more time than your colleagues do? Is it fair to tell a student that you cannot meet with her when in fact you have the time to do so? There must be a balance in there somewhere, although we have not found it yet. We could probably make our job more like two half-time positions if one of us taught in the fall, the other in the spring. There's a greater difference between teaching no courses and teaching one than there is between teaching one and teaching three.

Nonetheless, we do have a degree of leisure that few of our friends have. Peter, while he has temporarily abandoned his cello, has had the time to take a studio course in electronic music and to do more writing than he has done in years. Nancy, even during that difficult first year of teaching, has put considerable time into completing her dissertation. We have had time for trips to Chicago and New York, and, despite the meager offerings, we go to the movies even more often than we did in Chicago. We have, so far, been able to avoid the frenzy characteristic of Kirkland.

Since we both work at the same college, teaching similar (and in the case of Expository Prose, identical) courses, we are also in a special position to give each other advice and support. This goes beyond the kind of general support that any two academics can give each other (suggestions about how to deal with classroom situations, about curricular planning, etc.). Since we are each familiar with the specific academic context in which the other is working and since we know each other's students, we can help each other out in very specific matters. It's not simply, "Maybe you could try having your students write journals"; it's "Maybe you ought to have Anne try this story." And since we are generally more interested in things we know about, we have found an increased interest in each other's day-to-day work that has contributed substantially to our closeness as a couple.

Our intimate familiarity with each other's work also helps our students in ways beyond our improved teaching. For example, when one of us is unable to meet a student who drops by, the other can often step in and help out. An outside person with the authority of a spouse can also deliver a well-earned compliment which the teacher him/herself might feel uncomfortable expressing, or which the student might be less likely to discount coming from a secondary source. ("You mean she liked my paper so much that she showed it to you?") And students who come to see one of us often wind up with a team conference. (How can Peter, who hates Henry James, resist chiming in when he hears that master's name mentioned?) Since our styles as individuals, as teachers, and as critics are quite different (it has not been easy to yoke them for this article), our students are treated to two substantially different perspectives. This provides a chance to witness a real intellectual debate between two people who disagree, but respect each other: a model they rarely see in the regular curriculum.

But this kind of closeness nourishes difficulties as well. While we think we have coped with them reasonably well, there are drawbacks which other couples considering a joint appointment ought to know about. Sharing a job has proved an extremely intense experience, far more so than we had imagined. Some of this has, of course, to do with living on campus, some to do with our particular relationship; but much of it is inherent in the joint appointment. We are together for a larger part of the day than most people are: we eat all our meals together; we go to many of the same meetings; we see each other between classes; we use the same faculty lounge; we even share the same library study. We frequently see each other while having conferences, as well. This is where we most often get in one another's way. Since Nancy's office is in the apartment, Peter is often listening to music or reading while Nancy meets students. And since Kirkland has a shortage of classroom space, either of us is likely to meet with small groups of students at the house while the other is on the premises. This is fine when the uninvolved party wishes to join in, or is willing to hide in the bedroom, but it can be annoying when he or she simply wants to stretch out and listen to Mahler.

But the intensity goes well beyond that imposed by the limitations of physical facilities; it could not be eliminated simply with larger offices, more classrooms, and a second library study. Think of the social and psychological effects of working at the same job. Until you have been

through such prolonged, enforced togetherness, it is easy to underestimate just how much release there is when one member of a couple can provide a fresh, outside perspective on the situation of the other, and how much is lost when this outlet is removed. The same worries haunt us; the same paranoias plague us; and we thus tend to feed each other's depressions as often as we relieve them. How can we escape, even momentarily, from the pressures of the job when we can't listen to a spouse tell stories of his or her own? (In fact, we can't even come home and tell anecdotes about the faculty meeting. There's not much in the way of "news" at dinner.) Our friends are the same friends. This leads to considerable social comfort, but it also means that neither of us is likely to bring home someone the other does not already know. And since virtually all of these friends are either faculty or faculty spouses at Kirkland or Hamilton, there's not much escape from the job even when out on a visit.

For this reason, our trips out of town—and our summers away from Clinton—are more a necessity than a luxury. Fortunately, our joint appointment gives us flexibility here, too. It would be impossible for a single faculty member to teach three hour-and-a-half classes on a single day. But it is quite easy for the two of us to do so, at least while we are both teaching both semesters. We have thus been able to arrange a short work week which gives considerable freedom for travel, although we have not exercised it nearly as much as we should.

Our job also fosters a bizarre mixture of cooperation and competition. Thanks to the joint appointment, we each have an increased professional and economic interest in the success of the other. (Our contract specifies that if one of us is let go, the college has the option of either firing or keeping the other full-time. But it is obvious that the latter situation would be unlivable for the severed party, so our fates are inextricably linked.) Thus, we each do whatever we can to ensure the success of the other: one of us will take on extra household chores when the other is behind in reading or swamped with papers, or will act in the other's stead when students show up with problems that we are equally capable of handling.

This, too, may backfire, however, and people undertaking a similar position should be sure that they respect the abilities of the other party. As one student remarked, it's a bit like a three-legged race: your job and tenure are tied not only to your own performance, but also to that of another individual whom you can't control. This can be as frightening and frustrating as the free time can be liberating.

Furthermore, it would be naive to assume that even the healthy camaraderie completely overshadows our individual egos: each of us wants the other to do well, but each of us also wants to do even better. The competition was particularly keen during the spring, when we were both teaching sections of Expository Prose. For a while, we made the mistake of using some of the same materials in class, sometimes even on the same day. Swapping stories about how class went was guaranteed to make one of us miserable. ("How did you get the discussion going on that? No one in my class was the slightest bit interested.") Intellectually, of course, we knew that differences ought to occur. Nancy's class was almost exclusively freshmen; Peter's was primarily older students. Nancy's class consisted of a very heterogeneous mix of students with radically different writing problems; Peter's class was much more homogeneous, and his students, being older, had a clearer idea of just what they wanted to learn from the course. Nancy was in her first year of teaching and had never taught this course before; Peter had years of experience and had taught this very course at Kirkland in the fall. And yet we did compare ourselves against each other, feeling elated and condescendingly sympathetic when our own section did particularly well, feeling slightly put off when our partner had an especially good day. In general, we do not consider ourselves terribly competitive people, and except when course evaluations came around, the strain on our marriage was manageable. But the competitiveness lurked beneath the surface nonetheless and made us postpone our decision to team-teach a single course, which we had planned as one of the things we would surely do.

We do, of course, think frequently about our shared job and the assets and drawbacks we've been discussing. But concentrating on these issues as we have done for the purposes of this essay may be misleading; most of the time, while we are actually working, we're not really conscious of the joint appointment as such. This may be a pitfall; perhaps we have had difficulty in drawing the line between too much and too little because all our assumptions about teaching come from a full-time definition of the job. But it is also a sign that we've found the situation generally comfortable. The arrangement as we have worked it out obviously wouldn't be right for every couple; it may not be right for us five, ten, or twenty years from now. But at the moment, it fits our needs so closely that we wouldn't give it up, and we're looking forward to our second year when it should run even more smoothly.

Colleges Say They Get More for Their Money by Hiring a Couple to Share One Faculty Job*

Liz Roman Gallese
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

Steven Brenner and his wife, Pat, began searching for jobs teaching college economics a year ago. After scores of interviews and rejections, they each finally got an offer: from two colleges separated by 50 miles of winding mountain road. If both were to accept, "it would have meant living apart during the week," Pat says.

A decade or so ago, if a young couple was faced with that prospect, the husband typically would have accepted his job offer, while the wife put her career in abeyance and dutifully followed him. But because the Brenners, like many couples, believe both husband and wife should be free to pursue careers, they settled on an intriguing alternative: sharing one job. Together, they accepted a $12,540 teaching position at Grinnell College, a small, liberal-arts school in Grinnell, Iowa.

Like three other job-sharing couples at Grinnell, the Brenners teach different courses in their own specialties, have separate offices, and keep different hours. "Our fields overlap only to a degree," says Pat, who is teaching statistics and international economics this semester, while Steve lectures in U. S. economic history. Though they split one salary, they're both earning credit toward tenure. Because of the arrangement, Steve has more time to work on his Ph.D. thesis and Pat has the assurance that she won't be forced to quit when they have children.

A 125% Effort

The Brenners' happy accommodation is matched by Grinnell's satisfaction with the plan. "It gives us an opportunity to get more women on the faculty," says Dean Waldo S. Walker. "And we get more for our money. Two people expend 125% on the job and add an extra degree of expertise in small departments."

Mindful of these advantages, colleges across the country are giving job-sharing a whirl. Stanford University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Hamline University, and colleges like Carleton, Oberlin, Hampshire, and Gustavus Adolphus all have at least one couple sharing a single faculty position and say they want more. Dozens of other schools, including Colorado College, Bucknell University, and the University of Delaware, say they are considering the concept.

"It will be universal in time," says Felice Schwartz, president of Catalyst Inc., a New York organization that explores nontraditional work patterns. "Our whole society is moving toward part-time work, as women want to work and make a contribution, and men become less concerned with the Protestant ethic of work for work's sake."

Job-splitting isn't brand new, nor is it confined exclusively to college campuses. The Framingham, Mass., school system pioneered the idea in 1965, hiring elementary school teachers in pairs. In 1968, the Massachusetts welfare department hired 50 half-time women for 25 full-time social-worker slots. More recently, the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston allowed two people to split an assistant vice-president post.

Parallel Careers

Job-splitting comes naturally to some couples with similar credentials. The careers of Adam and Maureen Yagodka, for example, have run parallel almost from the start. Both hold Ph.D.'s in human ecology from the University of Oklahoma and worked together training a Job Corps staff and as consultants to Oklahoma's Health Department before taking a joint position at M.I.T. There, they work as a team, designing and implementing personnel programs for the school's nonacademic employes.

"Because we're both interested in the same thing, we've taken a definite stand on working together as equals," says Maureen. The couple turned down one joint offer to do consulting work after their supervisor introduced only Adam at a conference and indicated salary and benefits would be in his name. "It sounded more and more like Maureen would be coming along as a volunteer," says Adam.

Not all joint positions call for identical credentials. For nearly two years, Linda Gillies and Cynthia Lambros shared a job setting up exhibits at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. The two friends had worked together previously and suggested the plan to museum officials when they were both looking for part-time work. Because Mrs. Gillies had more

*Reprinted with permission of The Wall Street Journal, ©Dow Jones & Company, Inc., 1974. All Rights Reserved.

experience and an edge in academic credentials, she was made assistant curator at an annual half-time salary of $7,000. Mrs. Lambros worked as a research assistant for $6,000 a year. "It gave me an opportunity to learn a whole new area," Mrs. Lambros says.

Is Business Next?

Although job-sharing may seem more suited to the university environment than the more rigid work schedules of private industry, some experts predict it will eventually be commonplace in the business world as well. "There's no question that job-splitting (in industry) will happen in the reasonably near future," says David Meredith, a specialist in manpower planning at McKinsey & Co. in New York. As companies find it increasingly difficult to get qualified people who are willing to work full time, he says, "management will begin questioning whether it needs one person for eight specific hours."

The big push to hire more women may speed the introduction of job-sharing in business, just as it has on campus. College administrators, under stiff pressure to meet federal affirmative action requirements or risk losing precious federal funds, have seized on job-sharing as a way of recruiting more female faculty members. Small rural colleges are leading the way because they have the most difficulty recruiting women. Last year, for example, Oberlin College in Oberlin, Ohio, offered a young couple a joint post in its psychology department. Norman Henderson, department chairman, explains: "A small Midwestern town like ours isn't a place an unmarried woman would be happy with. Couples are more likely to settle here."

The Oberlin couple has also added welcome diversity to the small department. "We've got a dual person," says Mr. Henderson. "She's more interested in language development, he in cognitive thinking." Moreover, he says, the wife taught a course in the psychology of women that the school wouldn't otherwise have been able to offer.

Deluge of Applicants

Much of the pressure to create shared teaching positions still comes from the couples themselves. Largely because of an extremely tight academic job market, colleges report a deluge of applications from younger couples seeking to begin mutual careers. (One pair of Carleton hopefuls billed themselves as the "dynamic duo.") For older couples, job-sharing gives established professors more time for research while allowing their wives to resume teaching careers.

Three years ago, for example, Pat Dean suggested at a faculty party that she share husband William's $15,000 tenured position in the religion department at Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn. Mrs. Dean, who had interrupted her own teaching career to have children, was startled when the dean dared her to have a proposal ready for the following Monday. Now she is teaching women's studies at the college, and she and her husband share housework and child-care duties. William is pleased with the arrangement because it allows him far more time for research.

College administrators agree that couple teams work much harder than one full-time teacher. Oberlin, in fact, is so afraid of exploiting its teaching couple that it bars them from campus one day a week.

Job-splitting couples cost colleges a little more in dual travel expenses and larger Social Security payments on two salaries. And the arrangement complicates the disbursement of certain employee benefits, such as retirement insurance and disability payments.

"Better than Full-Timers"

But colleges are far more concerned about the complications that could arise if a couple divorces. To minimize the impact of a divorce, schools usually place job-splitting couples in the same department and write separate part-time contracts specifying the exact amount of time each partner will put in. Some colleges specify that if one partner leaves, the other must fill the vacancy by working full-time.

Another potential trouble spot is the matter of tenure. Most colleges allow regular part-time staff to accumulate tenure credit, some at the same rate as full-time teachers, others in double the number of years. But this practice is by no means universal; Gustavus Adolphus refuses tenure credit to part-timers working less than half time, thus excluding three of the four wives currently sharing jobs with their husbands.

All colleges insist on making separate tenure decisions about each partner, and this is worrisome to many couple teams. "Can you imagine the horrendous complaints by the injured party if one gets it and the other doesn't?" says Margaret Rumbarger, associate secretary of the American Association of University Professors. To guard against such disappointments, colleges choose only highly qualified people for job-sharing arrangements. "We don't consider a

couple if one is strong and the other isn't," says Oberlin's Mr. Henderson. "They each have to be even better than one full-timer."

Sample Shared Appointment Contracts

Agreement for (wife)

Bucknell University is pleased to offer you an appointment as an assistant professor in the department of political science for an initial period of three years commencing September 1974, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. The terms of this appointment are as follows:

1. The appointment will be for two thirds of a full teaching load as defined in the Faculty Handbook, and it will include a proportionate share of responsibilities for advising students, serving on such committees as may fall to your lot by election or by appointment, directing independent study and honors work, participating in the January Program, and participating in those other activities expected of a faculty member of a department, college and university.

2. This appointment is shared with (husband) a copy of whose contract is appended to this agreement; thus, a single position exists for purposes of tenure, sabbatical leave, and other attendant faculty privileges, except as herein noted; nevertheless, you will be eligible for tenure under those conditions which apply to other persons on probationary appointments. Since you and (your husband) occupy a single tenurable position, it is understood that tenure, if applicable, and institutional seniority are not transferable beyond that single position except by renegotiation of this agreement. In the event that either you or (your husband) should be unable to fulfill the conditions of your contracts or should one of you not be reappointed, the other shall become the full-time occupant of the tenurable position and retain tenure, if applicable, upon resumption of full-time responsibilities, under such terms of the Faculty Handbook as are applicable to the determination of tenure.

3. The salary for the initial academic year of the appointment will be based on the rate for a beginning assistant professor with the doctorate and some teaching experience, $11,400. For the academic year 1974-1975, your salary will be $7,600. Thereafter, each salary increment, if any, shall be two thirds that applicable to the rank and the merit rating established jointly by the departmental chairman and the Office of the President. Should you or (your husband) separate from the university for any reason, the remaining party's salary will be adjusted to reflect the return to a full-time appointment.

4. Except as herein specifically noted, fringe benefits will be based on the principle of the single tenurable position. By operation of law, F.I.C.A. payments, including both the employer contribution and the employee's payroll deduction are to be taken on both your salary and (your husband's) salary. Basic life insurance coverage will be provided by the university for both you and (your husband) and both of you will be eligible for additional coverage. Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage for the other is to be paid by you or (your husband) as you may designate. The principle of a single tenurable position shall govern eligibility for tuition exchange, cash tuition grants, and tuition remission. In the event of disability of both you and your husband, sick leave and disability insurance will be based on the single salary of the highest paid of you and your husband. In the event of disability of you or your husband, no payments will be made to the one who is disabled; the other of you will be expected to assume full-time status at the full salary of the highest paid of you and (your husband).

5. Other faculty perquisites, including office space, secretarial service, travel allowance, eligibility for research grants, and access to departmental resources, will be governed by the principle of the single tenurable position. The recognition of your need to have available the conditions related to effective scholarly teaching suggests that the principle be tempered, as resources may permit, to include eligibility for special travel funds and a faculty study or its equivalent.

6. Those rights of membership in the faculty which are conferred by the faculty upon its membership, specifically, the right to vote and the right to serve on its committees, and the rights of membership in the College of Arts and Sciences with the attendant privileges and

obligations will be governed by the principle of the single tenurable position in a manner to be determined by those bodies.

January 1, 1974

Wendell I. Smith
Provost

Agreement for (husband)

Subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, Bucknell University is pleased to modify your appointment to the faculty to enable (wife) to share the position which you occupy. Effective September 1974, your appointment will be for two thirds of a full teaching load as defined in the Faculty Handbook, and it will include a proportionate share of responsibilities for advising students, serving on such committees as may fall to your lot by election or by appointment, directing independent study and honors work, participating in the January Program, and participating in those other activities expected of a faculty member of a department, college, and university.

The conditions which are applicable to this appointment for purposes of tenure, leaves of absence, indirect benefits, and other attendant faculty privileges are those which also are applicable in the contract of (wife) a copy of which is appended to this agreement.

You shall be eligible to apply for and receive one standard sabbatical leave based on your elapsed six years of full-time service to the university assuming the approval of the Committee on Scholarly Development. If you elect a one-year sabbatical leave and (your wife) does not teach that year, your salary will be one half that which you would receive as a full-time member of the faculty. If (your wife) teaches two thirds time, your salary for a one-year leave will be one half of the contracted rate for your two thirds time appointment. Should you and (your wife) wish to propose some other combination of teaching and sabbatical leave for that academic year, you may negotiate it with the Provost.

If you and your wife remain on a shared appointment for an additional seven years, each of you will be eligible for sabbatical leaves based on actual salary with the understanding that both of you must take leaves at the same time as a single position.

The salary for the first year of this agreement will be two thirds of the rate given in your 1974-1975 salary letter. For succeeding years, each salary increment, if any, shall be two thirds that applicable to your rank and the merit rating established jointly by the departmental chairman and the Office of the President.

January 1, 1974

Wendell I. Smith
Provost

The Invisible Woman: Footnotes from a Faculty Wife

Sandra Holstein

In academia, as elsewhere, a married man with children is considered the most desirable candidate for a job. Next in line is the married man, the unmarried man, the unmarried woman, the married woman, and last the married woman with children. This view is based on stereotypes: that a married man with children is most stable and dependable, an unmarried man less serious about his work, and a married woman occupied with her family to the exclusion of all else. It is also based on prejudice; how else can one explain the single man being preferable to the single woman? Do people who profess to be intellectuals skeptical of easy generalizations and distinctions still believe with Byron that "Man's love is of man's life a thing apart, / Tis woman's whole existence"?

Once almost everyone accepted these stereotypes. As an undergraduate, I had assumed that a choice had to be made between marriage and college teaching. Any male one met would be likely to reinforce this idea, whether a helpful father-figure professor or a self-interested suitor. Men were quick to argue that marriage and a Ph.D., much less a career, were mutually exclusive. But attitudes concerning women's place have changed. Men have changed. And I have changed. Academia, however, has not changed. The men's club atmosphere still prevails, and, if women are not welcome, academic couples are even less welcome. A man who roams the halls of academe together with his wife is not, after all, one of the boys, and thus, he threatens the self-image of his colleagues. Wives are the least compatible and most incongruous part of the image of the community of scholars. A wife at a faculty meeting is similar to one of those pictures captioned "What's wrong here?" A faculty wife is denied intellectual status because as a married woman she is only an appendage to her husband. But when she attempts to make it intellectually and professionally on her own, she is again denied because she is married and is a woman. The message from academia to the ambitious woman is the same as the message society gives to all women: "stay in your place."

Discrimination arises when a group considered to be inferior threatens to achieve the same status as the "superior" group. Students are no threat to the security of professors. As an undergraduate, I was aware of no overt discrimination against me. In fact, I was helped a great deal by many professors at UCLA. That is not to say that I was unconscious of my plight. These same professors warned me that I would experience discrimination when I looked for a job. They told me of the problems of female professors in their department, as did these women themselves. And there was the "advice" of the Dean of the Graduate School, an English professor, who warned me to stop advancing before I lost my femininity. "College professors are tough-minded and determined," he informed me, "while women are by their very nature, unthinking and yielding." The advice of a female professor was of a different nature: "Go to Berkeley," she said. "That's where the men are. You'll never get married if you go to Minnesota."

This last remark reinforced my intention to attend the University of Minnesota, and I set out for graduate school. Again I experienced no overt discrimination by my professors. At Minnesota, as elsewhere, graduate students were treated coldly and impersonally by the senior faculty no matter what their sex. Graduate school was a dismal experience for all. It was a male student who remarked on the ludicrousness of having to apologize to a professor that his father's death would make him unable to take an exam.

However, although female students were not discriminated against, neither were they discriminated for. There were no "fair-haired boys" of the female sex. I never saw an NDEA fellowship or high honor go to a woman although I can think of three women in particular whose minds could be rivaled by no man's in the department. Although no woman student complained bitterly in private about discrimination--as the female faculty members did--the same poor attitudes and condescension were available to all. After all, the same group of professors who asked a tenured female associate professor to leave when she married an untenured male assistant professor wrote recommendations for graduate students of both sexes. And it was the chairman at that time, who, when I suggested that someone should teach the works of Virginia Woolf, replied, "She's no Charles Dickens."

There were, at Minnesota, two havens of peace and respect for graduate students of both sexes. One was the American Studies office strategically placed down the hall from the English department, which offered a personally tailored, intellectually stimulating program of study

which respected both women and American literature. The professor who presided over it was a woman.

The other haven was the offices where teaching assistants spent many of their waking (and sleepless) hours. There were good reasons for the feeling of equality here. First, as I mentioned before, the impersonality of the faculty and the difficulty of the long and laborious program caused intense camaraderie among the teaching assistants. We were, and are, extremely close friends. Women and men, we were in this together. Except for the usual crass allusions to female anatomy from time to time, the male students treated us with respect.

The Freshman English Program furthered this equality since it was governed by a council of teaching assistants with the help of a truly egalitarian faculty chairman. The only problem I ever experienced on the council was with a senior professor who professed, when we were choosing experimental courses from among the proposals, that he found the theme of the bum in literature "infinitely more interesting" than women in literature. What was significant about this incident was that none of the other council members—all male at the time—intruded one word into the ensuing argument between the two of us, though when the votes were tallied, both topics were chosen for freshman courses.

Yet there was perhaps, I would note, an even more subtle reason for this equality and respect among the teaching assistants at Minnesota. This was that many of us married each other. There were, therefore, no "student wives"; the two words were, as often as not, synonymous. And when the distinctions are blurred, when the categories are unclear, it is difficult to pigeonhole people and assign them labels. It is hard to be condescending toward those who hold the same position as you, who attend the same classes, and who have read the same books. On a more personal level, the husbands obviously respected their wives as colleagues, and there were no male and female distinctions in friendships. The men never went drinking without the women and the women never got together without the men.

One incident, however, revealed many latent sexist feelings among the graduate students. In 1970, two of the graduate students looking for jobs were husband and wife. They had carefully applied to schools in big cities and neighboring towns across the country. Since the husband was only beginning his dissertation and the wife had completed hers a few years previously, they had decided that in case they could not obtain jobs near each other, they would accept her position. No one doubted that the woman would get a good job; she was in Old English and linguistics, had been overseas to study on a fellowship, had been teaching at a small four-year college in Minneapolis, and was very attractive. Her recommendations were glowing. In short, her prospects were more optimistic than her husband's. Therefore, her interviews that year in Denver, when the woman's movement came to the Modern Language Association, were shocking. She was informed outright that, were she a man, she would be hired. What did her husband intend to do? What would she do if she became pregnant? These were the questions put to her on the interviews. She and her husband had been eagerly anticipating meeting with the University of Houston, since both had been asked for interviews. But when they entered the room, the chairman said, "There must be some mistake. We didn't realize that you were married. Mrs. -- you'll have to leave." No question about which one would have to forgo the opportunity. Her husband got an offer from Houston; she got a promise by the chairman that he would inquire for her at other schools in the area. Each time they wrote him during the next few months, the chairman replied that he was working on it. Then, suddenly, months later, another university in the Midwest had a vacancy due to the death of a professor and offered this woman a job on the basis of her strong dossier without ever having seen her. She wrote to the universities in the Houston area, still optimistic about an opening. One informed her that they never had any intention of hiring anybody; Rice said that they did not hire women. The chairman at Houston had obviously done nothing. Her decision seemed to her to be to go to the University of Houston, about which she had negative feelings by this time, as a faculty wife and maybe never teach again, or to take the other job, and they would try to get together the next year. In desperation, and with the understanding sadness of her husband, she took the job.

The reaction at Minnesota was intense and the situation a constant source of talk. Since my husband and I were close friends of theirs, the questions were usually directed at us. How could she do this to him? "She must be a terrible wife," was the consensus. They obviously had had a failing marriage before this. "Would you 'let' your wife do this?" my husband was continually asked. "Would you do this?" I was asked. The shock lasted until the summer when we all left Minnesota. It was emotional and strong. No one ever took the wife's side or even tried to understand her predicament. And nobody ever questioned a profession that forces such a decision on people.

Being a faculty wife is totally different. Those who refer to the "lowly graduate student" have never been "faculty wives," in position one step above the protozoa on the Great Chain of Being. It is not a position they deserve, many being vital, educated, intelligent women. But the

condescension with which they are treated by both faculty members and, surprisingly, by students lacks all subtlety. For a faculty wife is not dictated to, patted on the head, or treated with any of the usual gestures reserved for female humanity—she is simply ignored.

The usual response to being so treated is to become invisible or go underground—the "who needs 'em" syndrome. Herein lies a problem for many people. It is difficult for a person to think, feel, and define herself in a vacuum. It is even more difficult to write when there is no community of ideas, no one even to talk to, with the exception of one's husband. To find oneself in a group of faculty and to speak about intellectual issues is to understand the meaning of "a voice crying in the wilderness." In most cases, none of your husband's colleagues will even look toward you, but will, rather, continue the conversation from the point before you spoke. (This refers only to serious talk, of course. Social conversation is allowed.) You are given a dismal choice: you can listen to untenured faculty expound their latest scholarly projects, clearly to impress the powers that be tenured. Or you can join the women and choose not to discuss either teaching, literature, or scholarship.

I should say, rather, join the wives. Female faculty members have their own battles to fight. Their goal is to define themselves as colleagues of the men rather than mere women, i.e., faculty wives. At Texas, female faculty members are invited to join the faculty wives' club and attend the teas and luncheons, the theory being, I suppose, that anatomy is the ultimate bond. And although the male members of the faculty will fawn over the young female members and protest at how bright and equal they are, they are still differentiated from the men. The attractive young ones are assigned to an inordinate number of university-wide committees, serving as decorations courtesy of the English department. And when a distinguished professor visits, he is shown the campus by male professors while the young female professors are asked to host luncheons and dinners for him. Faculty women, never men, are asked to contribute food to the department picnics along with faculty wives. So you see, these women do not want to add to the general inability to recognize their different status by befriending a faculty wife.

Perhaps these experiences are not universal; perhaps at other schools one is not considered unemployed and thus free when one is writing a dissertation and, therefore, called upon a week before one's preliminary orals to bake cakes and greet guests at a tea. But any woman who writes in her home in any English-speaking country will tell you that she is considered a "housewife who writes." Perhaps a person writing her dissertation is not greeted with "Haven't you given that up yet?" at a faculty wives' gathering, or with "What are you doing here?" when seen in the library by a colleague of her husband. Or told by an undergraduate that "Voltaire is a poet." But I fear that the University of Texas is not unique.

One experience, I would think, is universal for the academic wife. She will find that she lives in a twilight zone, surrounded by academic concerns and yet not in any way connected with the academy. For many of us who have defined ourselves as school people of some sort since we were five years old it is disorienting to be an alien on your husband's campus or, even worse, a "faculty spouse," a dependent who is granted special privileges for a small fee. At Texas, this is the only way I can eat in certain dining rooms or attend movies at the student union. And the only way to obtain a convenient library card, though I am a registered, fee-paying graduate student elsewhere, is as a "proxy" for my husband, ironically a word invented for teaching assistants rather than faculty wives. Only this way can I use all library facilities and keep books out for more than two weeks at a time. This is only one way I am reminded that I am not really part of academia. Most ways are more subtle, e.g., the "Oh, do you teach?" stare given if you enter into a discussion on classroom pedagogy. The community of scholars is not an open community. Even on a personal level: Is there a symposium in your field, a meeting of woman scholars, a lecturer you have wanted to meet, a Festschrift for a close friend? Nobody, not even a good friend, is going to tell you about it. If your husband does not know about something, neither will you. You are totally dependent on him and on the student newspaper for information and news from the university. I know only one person who acts as if an unemployed mind still functions. He leaves notes for me in my husband's mailbox whenever he comes upon a new work in my field, though he may little realize that I appreciate the gesture as much as the information it imparts.

It is demoralizing to live in a community where you are jokingly referred to as "like that" because of your feminism or paranoid because of your heightened consciousness. I know of only one other feminist in the English department although there are people of both sexes who loudly profess to being "liberated."

Many times I think that a more cosmopolitan city would be more conscious. After all, Texas is part of the Confederacy and not a center for feminists. But really the difference is only one of degree. At the University of Texas, my mail still reads, "Mrs. Michael." Here a senior professor can be heard to say that "women cannot cope with that," all the while ordering wives of his colleagues to cook and entertain for the visitors to the department. And a junior

professor will exclaim that his son will never wash dishes. But consciousness does not acceptance make. Although mail from Minnesota reads "Ms. Sandra," department members there are still fighting over discriminatory hiring practices. And it was the professor who helped me most at UCLA who straightfacedly quoted the head of affirmative action in the department as saying that she wants to hire women but just cannot find any who are good enough. A distinguished scholar visiting from Columbia University was more blatant. Women in academia are a "mistake," he expounded. "We hired one and she got lonely and pushed us to hire others. And as for couples in the same department, well, you know that wives always agree with their husbands," he told my incredulous husband. When I politely questioned his remarks, he abruptly left the room.

The solution to the condescension seems obvious: get a job at an unbiased department and one will no longer be classified as a graduate student or a faculty wife. With this step comes new problems. Last year I sent letters of application in response to the job lists, and I received dossier requests from nine major universities. Although I did not receive a position, I do attribute it more to the tight market and to the fact that I had only just begun my dissertation than to overt sex discrimination.

This year I sent exactly the same letter to different schools advertising in my field, with a noteworthy exception. At the end of the letter I added the following sentences: "You will note that my husband, Michael, is also applying for a job in your department. We would like to be considered (1) for a shared appointment; (2) for two separate appointments; or (3) independently." My husband added a similar sentence to his letters and we sent both letters with our vitae in one envelope. We sent 25 of these only to schools that had advertised for people in both our fields. Since most of the colleges wanting people in my field also needed someone in Michael's, I only sent about 10 other letters by myself. My husband applied to approximately 20 schools singly. The result was as follows: Michael received 10 dossier requests from schools he had applied to alone; I received one. More important, we received only one dossier request in response to our joint letters, and it was made to the Bureau of Recommendations at our graduate institution; we never had any direct communication from this school.

As usual with any case involving discrimination, we will never know the real reason for the poor response to the joint letters. The market is notoriously bad and our qualifications are very different (Michael had been an assistant professor for five years; I am just finishing my degree). However, we will never again acknowledge that we are an academic couple when applying for a job, much less send joint letters.

At this point, however, I have little faith in any kind of letter. First of all, there are few jobs for anyone of either sex. Second, despite those who seek scapegoats and accuse women of getting the few available jobs, women are still not wanted and couples are shunned. "I could have told you not to send joint letters," a friend who is often on the hiring committee at Minnesota told us belatedly. "We do not consider couples here; they are considered added trouble." As for applying as a single woman, it is difficult to assess the reason for the differing responses to my own applications since the job market was bad both times. Perhaps the fact that HEW has eased its pressure made a difference. For the last few years, conservative departments felt pressured to hire women. But this year HEW has changed the "hire" dictum to "seek," and anyone can consider a woman and ultimately find a "better man" for the job.

One thing is certain: women are still treated differently by hiring committees. The idea that a woman must be much better than any male applicant still prevails. For a woman to compete, she must be both brilliant and beautiful. Anecdotes abound after MLA Conventions about the "one that got away." Her body is always as voluptuous as her mind is dazzling. She is both the golden goddess and la belle dame sans merci. And she eventually accepts a job at one of the most prestigious universities in the country. The most desirable woman is never married, of course; of the women hired at both the Universities of Minnesota and Texas in the past ten years, only three have been married when they were hired.

One can also look at the comments made on prospective assistant professors' dossiers by the hiring committees. Unfortunately, the findings of the MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession (MLA Newsletter, Sept. 1972) are true. Most recommendations for women do discuss appearance, personality, and marital status, and women are characterized as good teachers rather than as scholars. Married women have the added problem that letters will compare them with their husbands. When I examined dossiers and reviewers' written comments about them, the problems that women face became evident to me.

The recommendations are the single most important item of consideration. Indeed, they are most often the only consideration. Comments on dossiers are concerned with who at where said what about the candidates. Objective information, such as that listed on the vita sheet, is ignored. Honors, experience, even publications are not mentioned. Reading the innuendoes in letters is all-important. Thus, job-seekers are completely dependent upon their recommenders,

and this usually means that the women depend on the viewpoints of male professors. For example, a reader comments on the merits of a poet with a pageful of honors and publications: "Nothing exciting here—a worker but what would she do here?" Another more revealing notation about the same woman reads as follows: "High marks on 'ability to get work done,' common sense, industry, versatility, getting work done, etc. but low marks on mind and appearance. A very poor bet, even if she does have the female gender. (She must really be ugly, judging by the comments . . .)."

That the candidate is of "the female gender" is usually in the minds of both the writers and the readers of recommendations: "I think I'm in love with (the reviewer writes what he imagines to be her nickname here). I wonder what kind of smile she has." On another applicant's dossier: "(and despite the fact that she was 'homecoming queen' at —— as an undergrad) she comes across (oops!!) in these letters." These are comments on the most highly favored candidates. Those less sought after are reviewed with less enthusiasm but with an equally sexist outlook. One woman "has 'tremendous drive . . .' —and with five children I don't doubt it!" Another is treated less generously: "Her husband is a good basketball player, but her dissertation is a bit farfetched. Am I to understand that he is also applying?" If this seems cruel, keep in mind that this woman's adviser concentrated his letter of recommendation on her husband.

In other words, a female candidate cannot expect that sexuality will play no part in her hiring. Her virtues will come as a surprise: Her dissertation topic "is the kind of thing I wouldn't think possible except from a 40-year-old Oxford man." Ironically, this honorific image will be forgotten when the same reviewer finds that it applies to a woman: "She will be 40 years old when she would come to us!" No matter how she herself ignores her personal life on her application, it will come to the fore. "Her personal data form (which I confess I scanned with a little interest) reveals that, among her other accomplishments and statistics there appears a husband" reads the comment on the dossier of one woman who signed herself "Miss." And if she admits to being interested in her sex on a historical or intellectual level by writing a dissertation on sex roles in literature, she is subject to outright vehemence against "this kind of opportunism and generally, irrelevant approach to lit. Why isn't she in sociology?"

The times are not in women's favor either. With a surplus of men on the market, Rosie is no longer needed as a riveter. Also, presently, the traditional ways of describing women are in disfavor. In his article on "English Departments and the Professional Ethos" (New Literary History, 5, Spring 1974, 565-93), Richard Ohmann points out that the values that faculty have made preeminent in American higher education are specialization, research, visibility among peers, and loyalty to the guild rather than to the college or university. English departments "serve the discipline and its traditions and respond to social change only within that framework." Thus, if women are to be incorporated into conservative English departments, they will have to accommodate themselves to the desired image. And if they are still classified as classroom teachers and sensitive minds as opposed to scholarly researchers and brilliant critics, they will not be sought after. They must show that they will bring the department acknowledgment and prestige nationally. The usual ways of describing women as "cooperating," "sensitive," "good," etc. are counter to the needs of the department "on the make." For the department members who are looking for young geniuses to bring them the reputation they could not make for themselves, a woman is superfluous when viewed as a "very, very good teacher but little else—and we need much more." "We are sufficiently supplied, I think, with staff members who have her qualifications" is a more honest and telling appraisal.

Changing attitudes must be the first step in overcoming discriminatory policies; much consciousness raising is necessary on all levels in order for the woman scholar to assume her place in the university. The blame does not lie with any one group; the people I have quoted above range from administrators to students. All but one of the dossier readers quoted are assistant professors under thirty-five years of age. And one is a young woman. All of these people need to be made conscious of how they categorize people and how the language they use to describe people helps others categorize them as well. The falsity of these labels must become apparent and the distinctions must no longer be drawn. For as long as there are categories based on sex and as long as these labels are incorporated into the language of those who recommend and hire women, women will never be considered as good as men.

Academic couples would provide an ideal solution. Besides providing models for students who think that marriage and a profession are incompatible, couples who perform the same tasks would show that there are no "feminine" and "masculine" ways of thinking and working. They would show how the labels of "husband" and "wife" do not determine a person's scholarly or teaching abilities. And as an added benefit, they would humanize the profession by revealing to students that professors are also human beings who have lives outside of the classroom.

However, this solution is part of the problem, because the stereotype inhibits the remedy. In other words, saying that people would lose their prejudices against couples and women if they

were to work with them is futile since these prejudices keep women from being hired in the first place. Women may find, as have other minority groups before them, that getting jobs and gaining acceptance are two different paths to genuine equality, the former path traveled through legal and political means and the latter through personal relationships and education. It does seem as if the two paths circle each other at times. If women and couples are hired and prove their worth, one would expect a higher degree of acceptance. And if women are accepted as equal human beings with complete mental capabilities, it would seem that resistance to working with them would disappear. But this is speculative since at the moment neither condition exists to influence the other. Most of us would like to obtain both job equality and mutual respect from our colleagues and, therefore, try to follow both paths simultaneously. However, neither one seems to be leading anywhere now.

Two Non-Sexist Gay Grooms behind the Cotton Curtain

Louie Crew

Prolegomenon

Our marriage, like our courtship, has been conventional. It was love at first sight when we met at the elevator just outside the sixth-floor tearoom of the Atlanta YMCA. Ernest was a fashion coordinator for a local department store, I a state college professor from 100 miles away, deep in the peach and the pecan orchards. One of us Black, the other white; both native Southerners. We commuted every weekend for five months. Our friends were not surprised when we decided to marry.

We would have wasted our time to send an announcement to the local papers. Besides, the bank employees spread the word just as effectively when we took out a joint account. Our wedding itself was private, just the two of us and the Holy Spirit. Parents, although loving, would not have welcomed the occasion; our priest would not have officiated even had he been granted the Episcopal authority which was expressly denied. Two apartment neighbors, historians, sent a bottle of champagne; a psychologist friend dropped in earlier to propose a toast; others sent welcoming tokens.

We unloaded the heavier gear from the car before beginning the ceremony. Then we carried each other across the threshold into the dining room, where the table was set with two wineglasses from Woolworth's, one lone and lighted red candle instead of our customary two green ones, a vase with one early narcissus, and an Open Book of Common Prayer. We read the service nervously, its fearsome bidding and pledges. The words woman and wife translated readily as spouse, man, husband, Person. All took only about ten minutes.

One could be too quick to sentimentalize a few details, such as our bed, a two-hundred-year-old four-poster built by the slave ancestor of one of us for the free ancestor of the other. Perhaps we were fulfilling their dream? Or Dr. King's dream...? We find day-to-day living too difficult for us to negotiate other people's dreams: we work at living our own dream, a dream no different from the dream of many other couples, a dream of a home with much love to bridge our separateness.

After the Honeymoon

Our careers have always been very important to both of us. We came together from the beginning anticipating many of the inevitable tensions between our rival commitments to careers and to each other. We both had already enjoyed professional success in a variety of occupations: our main challenge was clearly going to be whether or not we could succeed together. One of my biggest hesitancies during our months of courtship was my fear that I might thereby seem to commit myself to conjugal activity as much of the time when we lived all of our time together. Little did I realize that Ernest too enjoys working alone many days on end for 14-16 hours a day.

Ironically, earlier lessons from our oppression as relatively less conspicuous Gays served as resources for our thriving as an openly Gay couple employed behind the Cotton Curtain. Gays learn very early that most jobs are not secure for those even suspected of being Gay. Very early on Ernest had been fired from a civil service job when he refused to go to bed with a male supervisor, who then had had Ernest "investigated" and "proved" Gay. All of my teaching

N. B. The first four paragraphs appeared in Integrity: Gay Episcopal Forum (March 1975), p. 11. Harper's has accepted them for "Wraparound" but has delayed publication indefinitely.

assignments have been filled with horrifying anecdotes about various predecessors who were fired when discovered as "queer." The effect of this clear pattern of discrimination was the same on both of us: prepare for as many jobs as you possibly can; never go into real debt; own mainly portable property; be able always to land on your feet.

Before we met, Ernest had supported himself with a variety of jobs—janitorial service, modeling, fashion coordinating, nursing. I had worked as a lumberjack, mechanic, professor, professional actor, waiter, writer. We both know that when push comes to shove we can always be caterers, seamsters, peach pickers. . . . What is more, we know that we would be better than most at any of these tasks. We have simply had to be sure of this kind of mobility. Tenure is always meaningless when one is Gay. I have never expected an institution to grant me tenure, and I have always been an excellent teacher precisely because I am willing to take the kinds of risks that are necessary to germinate ideas, the very kinds of risks that disqualify one with tenure committees.

This is not to deny the anxiety that accompanies threats to any job security, and certainly not to support those threats, but merely to put those threats into a perspective where we have been able to negotiate them reasonably successfully with, more important than any one job, our integrity preserved. Humor has been a saving factor repeatedly. When Ernest went to apply for beauty school, for example, the white ladies who ran the place were terrified at the idea of having a Black male there, assuming that his only motive would be sexual assault. When he sensed their fear, he explained to them that he is married to another man and they took him with open arms, knowing how delicious would be the fantasy of rape without the real risk on the part of what has become Ernie's steady stream of Southern Belles for customers.

Similarly comical was the relief that came after a bishop of the Anglican Orthodox Church had written to the local papers saying that the two of us by organizing a national group of Gay Episcopalians had been responsible for the devastating tornado that had recently struck Fort Valley, a tornado that left the two of us and our property unharmed while it knocked the steeple off every homophobic church in the white community. "Would one expect God to keep silent when homosexuals are tolerated?" the bishop asked. That evening in a spate of hate calls one familiar voice rang: "Louie, you and Ernest get yourselves on over here and kiss in my backyard so my greens will grow!" An administrator at the college jokingly called to suggest that I apply for head of agriculture: power to control the wind and the rain is queer power indeed.

Professional paranoia is an occupational necessity for open Gays. Right now I have in litigation a complaint against a major American university where I was denied employment by a homophobic dean after my winning the unanimous support not only of a search committee of faculty and students but also of the entire thirty-six members of the college's Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee. Damaging evidence is still being sent to me by the members of that Committee, who are irate that the dean violated due process and hired a candidate who had received absolutely no support. More typically, job applications for advertised positions never receive answers at all.

We have been no freer from domestic harassment. In August 1975, after a year of investigation, HUD found our complaint true that a local realtor had discriminated against us in housing because he considered us to be criminals. Still HUD had no enforcement powers; the realtor refused to conciliate; and no lawyer would take the case for contingency fees, knowing, as one lawyer said, "the predictable responses of juries in this part of the country." Meanwhile, in the white lower middle-class neighborhood where we live, nightly as I jog I am spat upon and verbally reviled by 8-, 10-, and 12-year-old children on bicycles, as their parents sit on their porches relishing their vain hopes that thereby their children will not grow up to be queer. Night after night, as Ernest has returned from cosmetology classes he has feasted on their verbal ingenuity, purposely taking up to ten minutes just to get his kit out of the car. There would be no help in protest. The police would only arrest us for "child molestation" or "contributing to the delinquency of a minor." The local Baptist preacher has already sent us a copy of a letter which he sent to the sheriff urging investigation.

Our friends here for a long time wondered why we do not at least keep a lower profile by not mentioning our relationship. It is important to Ernest and me that our relationship is public. We are not merely in a sexual union, but in a complex coupling that integrates all our life together. Whether we are entertaining or being entertained, even when we are just shopping at the local Piggly Wiggly, it is important for us to know that we know that they know. We can even sometimes get into enjoying their games with knowing, as when the employees all dash behind the butchers' one-way mirror to watch us wink at them when we pass. As Ernest puts it, "Honey, you may gloat, but we're the stars!"

White men have been having sex with Black men in the South since 1619, yet such homosexuality has always been related negatively to straight institutions and defined as

adultery, fornication, or sodomy. Our open marriage obviates these definitions. The effect is sometimes to move friends and neighbors into a new state of consciousness. Rarely if ever before on my almost all-Black campus has a dude proudly and publicly sported his white male spouse; rarely if ever before has a white man in Georgia proudly notified his family, prep school, even his chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, of his happy marriage to a Black man. If the profile is memorable, far more important is the consciousness we ourselves have experienced in this bonding.

Some of our friends elsewhere have accused us of masochism, saying that we ought to leave as soon as we get employment that is as challenging and fulfilling as that we now have, but no place is clearly enough a haven for Gay persons to justify our leaving at a cut in pay or our taking jobs that we would not find fulfilling. It may very well be an indictment of the so-called liberal white American universities that they leave to a small, struggling, rural Black college the admittedly difficult task of adjusting to an outspoken Gay scholar. Interestingly, the same persons who accuse us of masochism frequently control or at least influence jobs to which we might flee. At times it is difficult to stifle the bitter awareness of the eloquence with which they would write of our being lynched.

Our economic resources have been diverse, including Ernest's earnings from nursing and then from various student employments while studying cosmetology, including his unemployment checks for which he qualifies only because the state refuses to recognize our marriage, and including my salary as an associate professor, which remains conspicuously below that of unpublished but non-Gay colleagues of the same rank, as revealed in the Georgia state auditor's annual report. Speculations are legion as to why I have not been fired. I prefer to think that it is because I am lucky enough to have a chairperson who knows that I am a good teacher. She feels that none of my life, public or private, is of any concern to her unless it relates directly and immediately to my function on my job. Bosses higher up are more mixed. One official called me in almost immediately after my serving notice to students and officials that I am Gay: he said that he respected my courage. So did the chairpersons of at least two other departments. One very prissy boss, however, is threatened and brings visitors periodically to tut over a sign just outside my office: "Gay Community Raps: For Information Contact Louie Crew." Prompted by this administrator, the college president wrote asking me to remove the offensive sign. When I refused, the sign strangely started being taken down by vandals, but only on occasions when parents or other community persons were expected to be in the buildings. When Ernest similarly refused to do the work of an orderly while having the rank of an LPN, the hospital employer called him "uppity." When he tried to organize the Black aides to demand rights being denied them, the aides balked in fear and the hospital fired him.

One of the lowest points in our marriage was an occasion when I asked Ernest, "If you get that job with the cosmetics firm in NYC, can I live off your earnings so I won't have to stay here in Georgia the rest of this year?" He did not answer. I waited out the long silence almost half a day, and then he said, "Did I ask you could I 'live off your earnings' when I moved here from Atlanta without a job at first?" I had momentarily lapsed from the more pervasive economic structure that our marriage effects. Were we autonomous, at each trysting we would come at each other more unequally. I would be the wealthier, Ernest the younger; I the more experienced, Ernest the more spontaneous. . . . In marriage everything is given once and for all. For us marriage ended trading and introduced sharing. The money is OURS. The youth is OURS. The spontaneity is OURS. And whatever is exhausted or whatever is incremented is OURS. For me most earlier relationships had ended at the close of the mock honeymoons. We are free to discover new dimensions every day.

We find that marriage changes in kind the range of our personal and material security. Expressed negatively, Ernest gave up his fashion training in Atlanta to become a low-paid LPN in a rural hospital; I gave up a Fulbright to Turkey, where he would have no chances of employment. Ernest gave up his LPN so that we could be together for my summer as an NEH fellow at Berkeley. I took on our full support for several months while he was in school. . . . But this negative way of viewing our material existence ignores what we gained. By such choices (we do not even call them "sacrifices") we have effected the very possibility of working together. Both careers give and take from a union that is richer than either career or than any of our possible independencies. At least, we perceive ourselves richer, and as Geraldine says, "What you see is what you get!"

Although we are not likely to be altogether free of them ourselves, we find that many heterosexist ways of merely asking questions about relationships create problems for the relationships. "Who makes the money?" "Who spends the money?" "Who owns the car?" "Who owns the fur coat?" "Who owns the motorcycle?" "Who pays the rent?" "Who does the dirty work?" WE DO! is our answer to all of these questions.

My own neurotic compulsions with these middle-class perceptions have frequently inhibited my full enjoyment of our marriage. While I enjoy cooking, sewing, and more limitedly, keeping house, more and more my writing and my organizing activities have preempted the major portions of my energy. Ernest is a better cook, a much more efficient housekeeper, and an expert shopper. Once I came home late on a rainy night to find all of the washed wet clothes in the refrigerator. "What on earth!" I exclaimed. "Lord, child, you sure be white tonight," he laughed; "I can tell your mama never took in washing! It's the way to avert the mildew."

My learning to enjoy my man's househusbandliness as much as I enjoy my own is in many ways parallel to our enjoying all parts of each other's anatomy. The first question most Gay friends ask us is, "Which of you is the husband? Which the wife?" We honestly have no way to answer respecting this dichotomy. We are not thus differentiated. We both like gentle perfumes and we both like pungent funkiness; we both enjoy our gracefulness as well as our toughness. . . .

We are not mirror images, however. Our careers are different, and we are not competing. We make no specific demands about productivity, but we are both aware that a marriage is dead when either fails to want to contribute. Ernest respects the summers I spend not making a dime but writing away as if I'll not have another such season. I respect his taking off a year to go to school or his taking off time to do hair of women in the state mental hospital.

We also easily resist unhealthy veneration of each other. He is wisely suspicious of much of the pomposity of the academic community and I of much of the vanity of the cosmetic industry. Each of us is mature enough in his own career interests not to need much reinforcement, at times even to require welcome deflation. I doubt that the two of us could thrive very long together if we did not know that we definitely can "make it" apart. We are committed to a relationship precisely because it is "unnecessary." Of course, in the temporal sphere that we choose to cohabit we do need each other and we are able to be vulnerable; but we are careful never to require a longer rope than can pull each back to his own boat and anchorage. We are not drowning men clawing at a lifeguard, as seems to be the model fashionable in much non-Gay media these days.

At the risk of being still more invidious, I suspect that of the many non-Gay couples who break up, many break up because society's alleged supports of heterosexual relations are falsely advertised and hypocritical. After the honeymoon is over, once the careers pull at each other, once Jane and John realize that their parents might even expect them to divorce, that their priest is used to it, that their friends and neighbors are too busy with their own relationships to care (except possibly for the value of self-congratulation that attends efforts to seem to care), it is easy for non-Gays to walk away from each other in bewilderment, or to remain together only by law. Gay relationships may be paradoxically blessed by not having the chance even to assume support from family, community, or law.

Ernest and I understood our divorce contract at the outset: each will take half. We made out wills to structure property guarantees. We both own together all that each makes. We have had to make our own structure, knowing that major efforts would be exerted to deny even those plans. We have instructions about funerals, burial plots, etc.

We have had some few but very significant resources in our community, namely, in our friends. We are both gregarious and affable, and we are invited to many parties. Often he is the only Black or I the only white present, so segregated are the others in our community. We are mad dancers, and always do courtesies of dancing with our hosts' spouses. Maybe some index of our integration is the fact that only one couple has ever said that we should feel comfortable to dance together at their parties, and even there the other guests do not have an ambience about them that would make us feel comfortable doing so. Also, our Gay friends would be much too vulnerable for us to invite to Gay parties any of our non-Gay friends.

In many ways we did not even anticipate, our coupling is itself our career, so much does it alter our professional expectations, our job security, our work climate, etc. Everyone knows that Gay folks are reasonably harmless if we remain at the baths, the bars, the adult movie houses, the tearooms, and other such restricted areas. Ernest could have met a new Louie and I a new Ernest every night at the Atlanta YMCA for decades, and no one much would have bothered. Possibly a Tennessee Williams might have celebrated our waste, or maybe even a Proust. Certainly my priest would not have shouted, as he did recently, that we are "making a mockery of Christian marriage and the home." Then my bishop would never have written, as he did this week, "I am weary of almost constant pressure applied on this office by a movement which I do not fully understand, but which I wish to grow in understanding"--this while virtually telling me, probably his only regular Gay correspondent, that I persecute him merely by calling attention to my needs and the needs of my people! Were Ernest and I still just tricking furtively at the YMCA, my students would see me as they used to, as the linguist, the rhetorician, the literary critic, the poet, the jogger--and not, as so often now, merely as "that smart sissy." It is

only when we couple openly that the heterosexist culture marshals its forces against us.

The bonding we share has made us secure to take greater risks in thought and action. As open Gays actively fighting a very hostile environment precisely because of our sexual orientation, we have at home the quiet strong security of our love always attesting to the rightness of our public claims and countering the wrong attitudes about us that even we might otherwise find hard to resist. It has been impossible for us to doubt the beauty and the holiness of Gay love in general when morning, noon, and night we have known the beauty of our Gay love in particular. In the past I somewhat tentatively fought from the closet for Gay rights for others to be happier than I had ever been or expected ever to be: today I would fight openly to the end just for the two of us to be as happy as we are. Paradoxically, with "community" thus strongly narrowed to just the two of us, I simultaneously feel much more fully a part of the struggle of all Gay sisters and brothers everywhere and for all times.

APPENDICES

The Professionally Unemployed

(MLA Newsletter, Nov. 1973)

Both as cochairwoman of the MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession and as an academic presently without an academic job, a lot of my time is being spent thinking, and talking with others, about what it means to be professionally unemployed. Grim as the various job-market studies are, their statistics cannot convey the experience of those whose lives they quantify. That experience must be understood if MLA (and organizations like it) wishes to respond to the urgent professional needs of its unemployed members and those who would be, or were, its members.

Imagine having just finished a degree but not having found a position, or having had a job but been "let go." Financial realities press: unemployed means no paycheck. Perhaps, for a while, one can live on savings or unemployment compensation or with the help of family, spouse, or friends; perhaps it will be possible or necessary to find some sort of part-time work; perhaps, with relief or reluctance, one attempts to move "outside the field" to work or study. Whatever choices or options determine strategies for immediate, literal survival, unemployed also means no role or status in the work one chose and was trained to do. Are you a teacher if you aren't teaching? Are you part of the professional network without an institutional affiliation? Can you survive, literally or literarily, free-lance or part-time?

Until recently it was primarily women who had to ask these painful questions, when job opportunities and career plans were limited or interrupted by geographical considerations, family responsibilities, or outright discrimination. Others, whose work life was affected by health factors, have had similar concerns, as a letter to the Commission this summer reminded me, and those (mostly women) who began their careers late often suffered from the profession's assumption that everyone's career pattern is, or ought to be, straightforward.

As the "crisis in the job market" continues, however, more and more of us, men and women of all ages, will be faced with the fears and frustrations of unemployment. No one can promise anyone a job—and not everyone can be absolutely certain of retaining the one she or he has. Our efforts must continue to make equitable and humane the ways in which existing jobs are filled, and efforts must be begun to grapple with the political and economic forces that limit the number of positions available. Meanwhile, there are problems facing the professionally unemployed in our field to which MLA and its regional and discipline affiliates can appropriately address themselves. Some can be acted on directly; some will call for cooperation with and/or influence on other institutions; some are matters of policy-making and consciousness-raising within the profession.

The professionally unemployed, although neither a fixed nor a homogeneous group, are presently a major phenomenon in our field, as in others. It would be unfortunate if the response to the problems they present and represent were to be limited, individually or collectively, to guilt, embarrassment, or some version of an "I'm all right, Jack" attitude. The suggestions sketched below, arranged roughly by topic, are in no way meant to be comprehensive or definitive. I would hope they would be added to, amplified, and made into specific proposals by many who share my concern. They do indicate, however, something of the range and interconnection of short-term measures necessary if former and potential colleagues are not to be driven out of the profession by the profession itself.

1. Work: Part-Time, Shared-Time, Free-Time, Gravy

The professionally unemployed need work for income and want to teach to maintain their contact with students and colleagues. What mechanisms exist or can be created to provide more opportunities for them? What safeguards are necessary if such mechanisms are not to create, in turn, an exploited force of scab laborers?

As one of its 1971 affirmative action guidelines, the MLA Women's Commission called for flexible hiring policies, "in particular, to allow part-time teaching positions a legitimate and respected place within the profession." My reading of the data from the study which accompanied presentation of that and other affirmative action guidelines (PMLA, 87, 1972, 530-40) indicates that it is still a long way from being actualized; part-time teachers are not, as a matter of course, given pay and fringe benefits, departmental privileges and responsibilities, and consideration of tenure and promotion equal or equivalent to those of full-time staff.

Part-time positions were and are common. Shared appointments seem rarely to have been considered and even more rarely established. When the possibility of sharing a job has been

suggested, it has been most typically for a husband/wife team, but there is nothing inherent in the idea to limit its application, or its appeal, to spouses.

Although equitable part-time and shared appointments involve encounters with institutional inertia and budgetary constraints (growing, one might safely guess, more, rather than less, powerful), other teaching opportunities, to provide income, professional identity, or both, would seem to be immediately available within the existing structures of language and literature departments and the profession at large.

Invitations to give a lecture, or to co-teach a course sequence, or to participate in a colloquium might be extended informally, by a former graduate student's senior professor or former staff member's colleagues. Whatever options could be provided for keeping in touch with one's own mind and the minds of others would be welcomed by many, and for some these situations would offer continued basis for needed "classroom credentialing" for vitas or recommendations. More substantially, many departments are involved, formally or informally, in providing staff for night schools, extension divisions, NEH series, prison programs, etc. These sorts of part-time positions might—perhaps ought to be—shared with those for whom they would be the sole available contact with the classroom, and for whom the income they provide would be basic, not added.

2. Research and Scholarship: Writing Your Way Back In

Many of the professionally unemployed, whether waiting for "better luck next year" or moving into other areas of employment, would like to continue to function as scholars and critics. Without an institutional affiliation, however, they are at a disadvantage, real and felt. Few would argue baldly that the world of scholarship be closed to those who don't have jobs (or powerful friends), but unless structures are provided to help prevent it, that may become the reality of the situation.

How, after all, can one work as a scholar without access to library facilities? How can grants and fellowships be obtained without departmental sponsorship, and what about the increasing number of awards for which direct applications are forbidden and nominations required? If one manages to produce in any case, will editors and program chairpersons instinctively downgrade work submitted without an institutional address?

There may be no way to offset the lack of "desk copies" and other perquisites that come with access to departmental stationery and facilities, but could not ADE/ADFL chairpersons accept the responsibility of obtaining library privileges for those who request them, whether "their own" graduates or unemployed professionals living near their campuses? In what ways might MLA work to open up access to various grants, and act, if necessary, as a nonevaluative sponsor for those without other resources? What sort of continued consciousness-raising will be necessary within the profession to remind those in positions of judgment that the job market has not rejected only the incompetent?

3. Professional Courtesies and Other Survival Needs

Everyone is feeling the pinch of inflation, but some are feeling it more than others; it's one thing no longer to have your way paid to an MLA meeting by your department, another not to be able to afford to belong at all. Similarly, for some, "professional unemployment" may mean an administrative job, for others, no job at all. At the risk of stating the obvious, then, what accommodations in the rates for membership in professional organizations, registrations for meetings, and subscriptions to journals can be made to those who identify themselves as in real need of them? Could, for one thought, memberships be shared by other than spouses?

Elaine Reuben
Visiting Associate Professor and Director of Women's Studies
George Washington University

MLA Commission on the Status of Women: Affirmative Action for Women in 1971

(PMLA, 87, 1972, 535-36)

Flexible Hiring

Guideline: Establish flexible policies. In particular, allow part-time teaching positions a legitimate and respected place within the profession.

Thirty-eight departments, or 15% of the sample, have no part-time faculty at all. In the remaining departments the number of part-time faculty is small, with the exception of part-time instructors and lecturers. However, policies with respect to part-time appointments are of particular concern to women, for they constitute a majority of part-time instructors and assistant professors, and a larger proportion of associate and full professors than their proportion among full-time appointments at these ranks.

The Commission on Women found that university and departmental policies concerning part-time teaching vary widely with respect to salaries, fringe benefits, departmental responsibilities such as committee work, and the extent to which part-time teaching receives consideration in decisions on tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leave.

In 117 departments, or about half of those departments who have part-time faculty appointments, part-time teaching salaries are usually equivalent proportionally to full-time salaries. For example, in these departments the salary of a half-time appointment is usually equal to half the salary of a full-time position. In 68 departments (33% of those with part-time faculty) part-time salaries are established on a per-course basis, most often equal to $1,000-$2,000 for a year-long course. In the remaining departments part-time salaries are determined in some other way.

Among those departments employing part-time faculty, 55 (26%) are in universities or colleges which grant equal fringe benefits to both full-time and part-time faculty. In an additional 60 departments (29%) part-time faculty receive some fringe benefits, but not usually equivalent to the benefits of full-time faculty. In 78 departments (37%) part-time faculty members receive no fringe benefits at all.

In a majority of departments (134 or 64%) part-time faculty members are included on departmental committees or do participate in other ways in departmental decisions and activities. In contrast, 59 departments (28%) do not include part-time faculty in departmental decision making.

In most of the departments in our sample (150, or 72% of those with part-time faculty), departmental practices with respect to tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leave do not include consideration for part-time teaching. Forty-three departments (21%), however, do give at least some consideration to part-time work in making these decisions. Approximately one third of the departments in the sample (88) are flexible enough to permit their faculty members to move freely and without penalty from full- to part-time teaching or vice versa.

The Commission on Women was interested also in departmental policies concerning the employment of older women entering or reentering the profession and in the appointment of husband-wife teams. We found that a majority of departments believe they would employ older women who are resuming careers interrupted by marriage and child-rearing (80%), or older women who are entering the profession for the first time (73%). Thirty-four departments (14%) believe they would allow a husband-wife team to share an appointment, although only one department in the sample currently has such a team on their faculty.

ADDITIONAL READINGS AND RESOURCE PERSONS

Additional Readings

Abramson, Joan. The Invisible Woman: Discrimination in the Academic Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975. (Reviewed by Gloria Levitas in Change Magazine, Oct. 1975)

Anderson, B. Robert. "Adjunct Faculty Deserve a Better Deal." Change Magazine (Sept. 1975), p. 8.

Astin, Helen S., Nancy Suniewick, and Susan Dweck. Women: A Bibliography on Their Education and Careers. New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1974.

Martin, Donna. "The Wives of Academe," Women on Campus. Editors of Change Magazine. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine, 1975.

Sinowitz, Betty. "College Faculty Women Fight Sex Bias." Today's Education (Sept./Oct. 1974), pp. 1-3.

Weissmann, Myrna M., Katherine Nelson, Judith Hackman, Cynthia Pincus, Brigitte Prusoff. "The Faculty Wife: Her Academic Interests and Qualifications." In Academic Women on the Move. Ed. Alice Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

Resource Persons

Lois-ellin Datta
National Institute of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20208

Betty Sinowitz
Special Assistant
DuShane Emergency Fund
NEA Teacher Rights
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Jean King
Women's Law Fund
Law School Faculty
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Carolyn Polowy
American Association of University Professors
1 Dupont Circle
Suite 500
Washington, D. C. 20036

Marilyn Rauth
Assistant Director of Educational Research Department
American Federation of Teachers—AFL-CIO
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036